1	XAVIER BECERRA	
2	Attorney General of California E. A. JONES III	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General WENDY WIDLUS	
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 82958	
5	California Department of Justice 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702	
6	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2867	
7	Facsimile: (916) 731-2117 E-mail: Wendy.Widlus@doj.ca.gov	
8	Attorneys for Complainant BEFOR	E THE
9	ACUPUNCTU	JRE BOARD
10	DEPARTMENT OF CO STATE OF CA	
11		
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 1A-2015-25
13	NING LI, L.Ac.	
14	4025 Mira Mesa Avenue Chino, CA 91710	ACCUSATION
15		
16	Acupuncturist License No. AC 6715,	
17	Respondent.	
18		
19	PARTIES	
20	Benjamin Bodea (Complainant) bring	s this Accusation solely in his official capacity
21	as the Executive Officer of the Acupuncture Boar	d, Department of Consumer Affairs.
22	2. On or about May 31, 1999, the Acupu	ncture Board issued Acupuncturist License
23	Number AC 6715 to Ning Li, L.Ac. (Respondent)	. The Acupuncturist License was in full force
24	and effect at all times relevant to the charges brou	ght herein and will expire on May 31, 2022,
25	unless renewed.	CENTON
26	JURISDI	CHUN
27	3. This Accusation is brought before the Acupuncture Board (Board), Department of	
28	Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the	
		1

1	Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.	
2	STATUTORY PROVISIONS	
3	4. Section 4928.1 of the Code states:	
4	Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the Acupuncture Board	
5	in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount.	
6	T	
7	5. Section 4927, of the Code states:	
8	As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:	
9		
10 11	(d) "Acupuncture" means the stimulation of a certain point or points on or near the surface of the body by the insertion of needles to prevent or modify the perception	
12	of pain or to normalize physiological functions, including pain control for the	
13	6. Section 4955 of the Code states, in pertinent part:	
14 15	The board may deny, suspend, or revoke, or impose probationary conditions upon, the license of any acupuncturist who is guilty of unprofessional conduct.	
16	Unprofessional conduct shall include, but not be limited to, the following:	
17		
18	(d) Aiding or abetting in, or violating or conspiring in, directly or indirectly, the	
19	violation of the terms of this chapter or any regulation adopted by the board pursuant	
20		
21	(i) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of the acupuncture license.	
22	7. Section 4955.1 of the Code states:	
23	The board may deny, suspend, revoke, or impose probationary conditions upon	
24 25	the license of any acupuncturist if he or she is guilty of committing a fraudulent act including, but not be limited to, any of the following:	
26		
20 27	(b) Committing a fraudulent or dishonest act as an acupuncturist.	
28	(c) Committing any act involving dishonesty or corruption with respect to the qualifications, functions, or duties of an acupuncturist.	

28

- (d) Altering or modifying the medical record of any person, with fraudulent intent, or creating any false medical record.
- (e) Failing to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients.

8. Section 4955.2 of the Code states:

"The board may deny, suspend, revoke, or impose probationary conditions upon the license of any acupuncturist if he or she is guilty of committing any one of the following:

- (a) Gross negligence.
- (b) Repeated negligent acts.
- (c) Incompetence.

9. Section 810 of the Code states:

- (a) It shall constitute unprofessional conduct and grounds for disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of a license or certificate, for a health care professional to do any of the following in connection with his or her professional activities:
- (1) Knowingly present or cause to be presented any false or fraudulent claim for the payment of a loss under a contract of insurance.
- (2) Knowingly prepare, make, or subscribe any writing, with intent to present or use the same, or to allow it to be presented or used in support of any false or fraudulent claim.
- (b) It shall constitute cause for revocation or suspension of a license or certificate for a health care professional to engage in any conduct prohibited under Section 1871.4 of the Insurance Code or Section 549 or 550 of the Penal Code.
- (c) (1) It shall constitute cause for automatic suspension of a license or certificate issued pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 1600), Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 2000), Chapter 6.6 (commencing with Section 2900), Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 3000), or Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 4000), or pursuant to the Chiropractic Act or the Osteopathic Act, if a licensee or certificate holder has been convicted of any felony involving fraud committed by the licensee or certificate holder in conjunction with providing benefits covered by worker's compensation insurance, or has been convicted of any felony involving Medi-Cal fraud committed by the licensee or certificate holder in conjunction with the Medi-Cal program, including the Denti-Cal element of the Medi-Cal program, pursuant to Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 14000), or Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 14200), of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. The board shall convene a disciplinary hearing to determine whether or not the license or certificate shall be suspended, revoked, or some other disposition shall be considered, including, but not limited to, revocation with the opportunity to petition for reinstatement, suspension, or other limitations on the license or certificate as the board deems appropriate.
 - (2) It shall constitute cause for automatic suspension and for revocation of a

license or certificate issued pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 1600), Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 2000), Chapter 6.6 (commencing with Section 2900), Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 3000), or Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 4000), or pursuant to the Chiropractic Act or the Osteopathic Act, if a licensee or certificate holder has more than one conviction of any felony arising out of separate prosecutions involving fraud committed by the licensee or certificate holder in conjunction with providing benefits covered by worker's compensation insurance, or in conjunction with the Medi-Cal program, including the Denti-Cal element of the Medi-Cal program pursuant to Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 14000), or Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 14200), of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. The board shall convene a disciplinary hearing to revoke the license or certificate and an order of revocation shall be issued unless the board finds mitigating circumstances to order some other disposition.

- (3) It is the intent of the Legislature that paragraph (2) apply to a licensee or certificate holder who has one or more convictions prior to January 1, 2004, as provided in this subdivision.
- (4) Nothing in this subdivision shall preclude a board from suspending or revoking a license or certificate pursuant to any other provision of law.
- (5) "Board," as used in this subdivision, means the Dental Board of California, the Medical Board of California, the California Board of Podiatric Medicine, the Board of Psychology, the State Board of Optometry, the California State Board of Pharmacy, the Osteopathic Medical Board of California, and the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners.
- (6) "More than one conviction," as used in this subdivision, means that the licensee or certificate holder has one or more convictions prior to January 1, 2004, and at least one conviction on or after that date, or the licensee or certificate holder has two or more convictions on or after January 1, 2004. However, a licensee or certificate holder who has one or more convictions prior to January 1, 2004, but who has no convictions and is currently licensed or holds a certificate after that date, does not have "more than one conviction" for the purposes of this subdivision.
- (d) As used in this section, health care professional means any person licensed or certified pursuant to this division, or licensed pursuant to the Osteopathic Initiative Act, or the Chiropractic Initiative Act.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

10. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1399.453, states:

An acupuncturist shall keep complete and accurate records on each patient who is given acupuncture treatment, including progress made as a result of the acupuncture treatments.

COST RECOVERY

- 11. Section 4959 of the Code states:
- (a) The board may request the administrative law judge, under his or her proposed decision in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the board, to direct any licensee found guilty of unprofessional conduct to pay to the board a sum not to exceed actual and reasonable costs of the investigation and prosecution of the case.

therapy is related to the use of an infrared light. Application of a modality to 1 or

28

This section discusses "Infrared Modality" and states: Application of infrared

more areas; infrared (limited coverage).

FACTUAL SUMMARY

- 16. On February 10, 2015, the Continental Assurance Company (CNA) notified the Board it was investigating Respondent for fraudulent billing. The Board initiated an investigation of the events underlying this report through the Department of Consumer Affairs, Division of Investigation (DOI). The DOI investigator conducted an investigation regarding this complaint and prepared a report of the investigation for the Board.
- 17. Documents were obtained during the investigation which included Respondent's redacted billing records as well as her testimony which was taken during the course of three depositions.
- 18. The investigation revealed that Respondent allegedly treated 28 individuals out of 60 people for injuries sustained on December 21, 2012, which resulted from a crash between a bus and a car. The day after the accident six of the individuals allegedly injured in the accident sought care from the Respondent. Ultimately Respondent treated 28 patients from the tour bus accident. The 28 patients Respondent treated underwent the exact same procedures (acupuncture with electric stimulation, heat lamp and massage) from the initial treatment to the time they were discharged, notwithstanding their prior medical history, their medical condition at the time they were treated, or age. The Respondent billed a total of \$204,955.00 for the care she provided to these patients.
- 19. Patients treated by Respondent retained attorney 1 ¹ who referred them to Respondent for treatment. Attorney 1 is the same attorney who represented Respondent in a 2012 automobile accident, and Attorney 1 referred Respondent to Doctor 1 for Respondent's injuries in the 2012 accident.
- 20. Respondent was questioned by CNA attorneys during three depositions regarding her treatment of the people injured in the tour bus accident.
 - 21. During the first deposition taken February 9, 2015, Respondent testified she received

¹ The names of the patients and/or witnesses are anonymized to protect their privacy rights. The names will be provided to Respondent upon written request for discovery.

a Bachelor's Degree in Physical Education in 1988 and a Master's Degree in Oriental Medicine in either 1998 or 1999. Respondent testified she owned three acupuncture clinics and occasionally taught acupuncture classes two to three a week before she ceased teaching because she was too busy seeing patients in her practices to teach. Respondent stated she normally sees 20 to 30 patients a day at her 3 practice locations.

- 22. Initially Respondent testified she did not think Attorney 1 referred any patients to her although she stated she had known him for several years. Respondent subsequently testified Attorney 1 had in fact referred patients to her and that she had referred patients to him. Respondent testified that Attorney 1 had accompanied patients to her practice when they received acupuncture treatment.
- 23. During her deposition Respondent disclosed Attorney 1 recommended Dr. 1 who treated her after her 2012 accident. During Respondent's treatment with Dr. 1 he examined her and recommended she submit to lower back surgery which she was too afraid to undergo.
- 24. When asked if she had talked to Dr. 1 concerning any of her patients Respondent said she did not quite recall but thought Dr. 1 might be an "orthopedic" [sic].
- 25. During the deposition Respondent subsequently testified that she had recommended at least one patient to Dr. 1. When Respondent was asked again if she had talked to Dr. 1 Respondent said there were some patients who asked her about him and she told them Dr. 1 was a good doctor. Respondent was asked once more if she had spoken to Dr. 1 and she said she could not recall but then stated she had spoken to Dr. 1 once or twice about one or two patients with severe symptoms.
- 26. During the March 31, 2015, deposition when Respondent was asked if she suggested to any of her patients that they see Dr. 1 she contradicted her previous testimony and stated she had not suggested or recommended Dr. 1.
- 27. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent revealed she failed to document in any patients' records that she had referred the patients to Dr. 1 for evaluation, nor did she document any of the patient records regarding her discussions with Dr. 1 regarding the patients' medical issues.

- 28. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent testified that Person 1 worked for her for approximately four years but she did not know if he was licensed in any medical field in California. Respondent testified she had instructed Person 1 to provide physical therapy and chiropractic services to these patients. Respondent denied that Person 1 provided acupuncture to any of the patients.
- 29. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent testified that Person 2, a massage therapist, worked for her and provided massage to her patients although she did not know if Person 2 was licensed as a massage therapist in California.
- 30. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent disclosed she did not know which patients had received treatment from either Person 1 or 2, because she did not document the patients' records with that information.
- 31. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent was questioned about her failure to document a treatment plan for each of the patients. Respondent stated she did not document treatment plans because she believed that acupuncture is very complicated, as it is done on various body parts.
- 32. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent testified her treatment plans for each patient was acupuncture and massage. Respondent testified she used acupuncture, electrical stimulation, and hot packs not cold packs to reduce swelling for each patient.

 Respondent stated there are all types of swelling and hot packs can help with some swelling.
- 33. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition a number of the patient sign in sheets for the patients' dates of treatment were produced which appeared questionable as all of the signatures looked as though the patient had signed the sheets on the same date.
- 34. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent disclosed that she did not document the patients' records with the appropriate acupuncture billing codes. Respondent stated she did not list codes for acupuncture treatment because she had so many patients she forgot to write in the codes. Respondent admitted that some of treatment codes in the patients' records were written in after the treatment dates.
 - 35. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition, when Respondent was questioned

about her billing practices, Respondent stated that it can take up to an hour to treat just one patient. However, Respondent was unable to explain how she was able to provide the exact same treatment to 23 patients on January 2, 2013, as reflected in the billing she submitted to CNA.

- 36. During Respondent's February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent testified she did not write progress notes for her patients because she believed regulations did not require written progress notes for each visit. Respondent stated that she did write notes occasionally but would not always document patients' progress at every visit.
- 37. Respondent billed for treatment of 20 identified patients but none of those patients' records revealed treatment by Respondent.
- 38. Many of the patients' records reflected treatment Respondent allegedly provided, but there were no patient signatures in those records. Other patient records did contain patients' signatures but the records contained no indication that any treatment had been provided. Respondent was unable to explain why there were numerous patient records wherein treatment was allegedly provided but there was no patient signature. Nor could Respondent explain why other patient records contained the patients' signatures but there was no treatment noted in the record.
- 39. Respondent denied any of her patients signed their treatment sheets in their records all on one day, and insisted that each treatment sheet in the patient's records was signed on the date the patients received treatment.
- 40. Respondent denied having the patients sign blank treatment sheets later filled in with alleged treatment dates.
- 41. Respondent was questioned about a number of patients to whom she had provided treatment. In one patient's records there was a sign-in sheet with his signature, dated May 22, 2013, but Respondent failed to document any treatment for that date. Respondent stated that was a mistake. Respondent billed the patient for treatment on December 21, 2013, but failed to document any treatment for that date. Respondent testified she could not recall why there was no documented treatment. Respondent documented treatment on March 6, 2014, but the patient did not sign the sign-in sheet for that date. Respondent testified that the patient forgot to sign.

- 42. Respondent admitted she did not write down a treatment plan for this patient who she described as being a "complicated" patient because of previous health issues (Respondent's discharge report for this patient stated "the patient had no significant medical history before the accident") but testified she had verbally discussed the treatment plan with the patient.
- 43. Respondent testified she treated this patient for a year and a half because he was not recovering. Respondent testified treating a patient that long would benefit the patient.

 Respondent could not remember if she spoke to Dr. 1 about the patient or considered sending the patient to Dr. 1 for treatment.
- 44. Respondent testified she saw this patient twice a week, providing free treatment for him from April 2014, up to the time of the deposition. Respondent testified she stopped keeping medical records for the patient after she stopped charging the patient for treatment. Respondent testified she was not aware that she had to document treatment she provided to a patient if she did not charge the patient.
- 45. During the February 9, 2015, deposition Respondent was shown a sign-in sheet for a different patient. The patient's sign-in sheet had been obtained by the CNA attorney in November 2014. The records did not show a treatment date of April 25, 2014, for that patient. However, Respondent brought records to the February 9, 2015, deposition for that patient which documented that the patient was treated on April 25, 2014. Respondent could not remember how the April 24, 2014, treatment date was added to her copy of the medical records after the CNA attorney received his copy of the patient's records in November 2014.
- 46. Respondent was questioned about another patient's records. That patient's records reflected on May 31, 2013, Respondent provided a half hour of acupuncture and a half hour massage on the patient's neck after the patient underwent surgery on that same date by Dr. 1. Respondent stated she would perform acupuncture on a patient who underwent surgery the same day if the patient did not have an open surgical incision.
- 47. During the second deposition taken on March 31, 2015, Respondent stated she could not remember when any of her patients had undergone an MRI as Chinese medicine doctors normally do not believe in Western medicine. Respondent stated that Chinese and Western

medicine have totally different practices and theories which explains why Chinese medicine doctors don't recommend that their patients see Western medical doctors. Respondent testified that from a Chinese medicine doctor's perspective the Chinese medicine doctor can tell what is wrong with a patient since the way a Chinese medicine doctor diagnoses a patient is different than Western medical doctors. Respondent testified that the difference between Chinese and Western medicine however, did not mean she did not want her patients to see a Western medical doctor.

- 48. Respondent testified that five patients had gone to Dr. 1 who performed surgery on the patients to relieve their pain. Prior to undergoing surgery none of the patients told her they were considering having surgery. Respondent said those patients stated Dr. 1 performed surgery to relieve their pain yet the patients returned to her for additional treatment. When Respondent was asked why the patient would come to her after undergoing surgery to relieve pain which continued despite having undergone acupuncture treatment from her, Respondent stated that surgery was recommended based on Western medical practice and she is not familiar with that area. Respondent testified she had no idea why her patients did not tell her they were planning to have surgery.
- 49. Respondent testified that she had no idea how it happened that 28 people from the same bus accident came to her for treatment. Six of the patients came to see Respondent the day after the accident. Respondent said she could not remember at which of her three practices she saw them, could not remember if the six patients each called to make an appointment to be seen that day, and could not remember if they all came together to be seen on that day. Respondent was unable to remember how much time it took to evaluate and treat all six of the patients who came to her office on the same day.
- 50. Respondent testified that after she saw the six patients, all the patients came back two days later. Respondent did not remember why all six patients would come back on the same day but opined it could have been that she had them all come back on the same day because they all had the exact same complaint. The six patients returned to see Respondent four days after their second visit, but Respondent could not remember why they returned four days after their second visit.

- 51. On January 2, 2013, Respondent testified she treated 24 different patients from the accident, 18 of whom were new patients. Respondent testified that when a new patient comes to her practice to receive treatment it takes about an hour to evaluate them and treat them.

 Respondent testified she couldn't remember how many hours it took to see the 18 patients.
- 52. Respondent testified she had hoped that all the patients would come to her for treatment but if she had known that it would have gotten herself in so much trouble, she would not have seen them. When questioned about what kind of trouble, Respondent testified because of the deposition she was not able to pick her son up from school and he had to walk home.
- 53. During both the second and third deposition which was taken on May 15, 2015, Attorney 2 was present. On May 15, 2015, the CNA attorney asked Attorney 2 if he was in fact representing Respondent and if so when Respondent had retained him.
- 54. Respondent said that Attorney 2 was not representing her. Respondent said that while she gave testimony if she thought she needed an attorney she would ask Attorney 2 to represent her. The CNA attorney told Respondent that Attorney 2 stated he was representing her, and if Attorney 2 was not representing her Respondent should so inform Attorney 2. Respondent stated she needed Attorney 2's services. Attorney 2 remained throughout the deposition.
- 55. The CNA attorney asked Respondent if she knew Attorney 2 was also representing all of the passengers injured in the accident. Respondent testified she was not aware that Attorney 2 was representing her as well as all of the passengers who had been injured in the accident.
- 56. During the course of the depositions Respondent testified Person 1 and Person 2 provided massage to the patients and explained the patients' exercise regimens to the patients and also helped the patients move around after massage.
- 57. Respondent testified that if one of the massage therapists, that is, Person 1 or Person 2, gave a patient a massage the massage therapist did not document the massage in the patient's medical records.
- 58. Respondent was asked if she could look at the patient records and be able to tell at which of her three practices the patient was treated. Respondent testified she could not because it had been so long since she has treated those patients but that some patients would be treated at

one practice and later they would go to one of her other practices.

- 59. Respondent testified the 28 patients underwent routine treatments which did not require her to perform Chinese Medicine. Respondent subsequently changed her testimony and testified she had in fact performed Chinese Medicine during her treatment of the patients. Respondent stated that because she was not asked to do Chinese Medicine, she did not record performing Chinese Medicine treatment in the patients' medical records.
- 60. Respondent testified that Western medicine does not require her to look at the patient's energy or pulse. Respondent stated after she examined a patient, she did not document her findings because she was not paid to write down her findings. However, Respondent testified that although she did not write down her findings after examinations, she did record the billing codes for the examinations.
- 61. Respondent testified that when she had a patient with muscle spasms, sometimes she would document the muscle spasm, but most of the time she would document the muscle spasm as pain. Respondent testified record keeping was not good after which she stated she needed to go to her practice and ended the deposition.
- 62. On March 1, 2017, the DOI investigator interviewed Respondent for the first time. During that interview Respondent stated she had had an acupuncture practice since 1999 and provided the addresses for her current three acupuncture practices. Respondent stated she sees 20-50 patients a day. Respondent stated she had a massage therapist that helped her in her practices. Respondent stated that she had hired various people to help her treat patients at the same time but those people no longer work for her and she does not know where they are.
- 63. Respondent said that she had given three depositions related to the billing and treatment she provided to 28 patients involved in injuries sustained in the December 21, 2012, bus and car accident. Respondent said she was not sure how the patients were referred to her but a lot of patients who were on the bus were old patients of hers.
- 64. Respondent said she had not been contacted by anyone other than the insurance company regarding her treatment of the 28 patients and did not have any idea why the investigator contacted her.

- 65. Respondent said that she had not been paid by the insurance company for any of the patients' treatment.
- 66. Respondent denied that she had committed fraud, or overcharged the insurance company for the patients' treatments. Respondent said she could not answer any of the investigator's questions regarding the case because she could not remember anything about it.
- 67. Respondent stated she needed to leave because she had patients that she needed to see in the afternoon. Respondent stated she would need to come back for another interview after she reviewed the patient records. Respondent subsequently hired an attorney who initially refused to allow Respondent to participate in a second interview with the DOI investigator.
- 68. On October 9, 2018, the DOI investigator interviewed Respondent for the second time. In response to the Board's subpoenas Respondent brought patient records for just nine patients with her. Respondent identified the nine patients' records as her medical records from her treatment of the bus/car accident patients.
- 69. During the October 9, 2018, interview Respondent stated that her husband, who worked full time at a toy factory, had done her billing for personal injury cases since 1999.
- 70. During the October 9, 2018, interview Respondent stated she hired other employees to assist her at her offices because she had so many patients she could not treat all of them. Respondent stated she hired four temporary massage therapists to treat patients from the bus accident. Respondent stated Respondent hired Person 1 as a full-time massage therapist who worked for her from 2012 until 2017.
- 71. Respondent stated she hired Person 2 as a massage therapist but could not remember his last name. She said that Person 2 started working for her in 2013, but once the patients from the bus accident completed their treatments she no longer needed his services. Respondent did not have contact information for any of her former employees.
- 72. Respondent stated she treated most of the patients at two of her three office locations. Respondent said that she could treat up to thirty patients in a day at one of the offices where she had four tables and one massage chair. The other office had five tables and one massage chair. Respondent stated a patient's treatment would last approximately an hour. Respondent stated she

treated five to six patients an hour.

- 73. Respondent confirmed all the treatment records for the nine patients provided to the Board were the same treatment records Respondent submitted to Attorney 1 who represented those patients in the December 21, 2012, bus and car accident lawsuit. The Respondent stated she neither provided the insurance company with the patients' treatment records nor submitted any billing to the insurance company.
- 74. At the October 9, 2018, interview Respondent reviewed treatment records for Patients' 1 through 9. Those records contained a summary report, "Statement of Professional Services Rendered," "Patient Information" sheet, and a treatment record form. The treatment record form contained a place for the patient to sign-in on the date of treatment.
- 75. Respondent stated during a patient's first visit the patient would fill out the "Patient Information" sheet on which Respondent documented the patient's initial complaint and medical history. At the end of each patient's visit, Respondent stated she would tell her husband what acupuncture billing codes to write on the patient's treatment record form.
- 76. Examination of each of the records for the nine patients revealed that none of the patient treatment records other than Patient 2's contained a treatment checklist. None of the treatment record forms contained any written documentation regarding the patient's treatment or progress.
- 77. Respondent stated her husband would enter billing code 99202 for a patient's first visit, billing code 99213 for a patient's second evaluation, billing code 97813 for acupuncture and electrical stimulation, billing code 97010 for heat lamp treatment, and billing code 97124 for massage therapy.
- 78. Respondent stated she does not write notes for any patient visits, does not normally keep notations of the patient's pain level nor what caused the patient's injury. Respondent stated she always remembered the last conversation with the patient and what their complaint was at that time. Respondent stated she reviewed what treatments she provided by reviewing the previous visit's acupuncture billing codes in the patient's treatment records. Respondent stated she would only write detailed notes when it was necessary to submit documentation for billing.

- 79. Respondent stated she wrote notes on scratch paper in Chinese which were not kept in the patient's file and then provided those notes to her husband so he could write a summary. Respondent stated she did not consider the notes to be part of the patients' treatment records but notes for her use which is why the notes were destroyed. Respondent stated she considers writing billing codes on the treatment records as the only necessary documentation for patient treatment records.
- 80. Respondent stated that Health Maintenance Organization insurance companies require her to fill out a checkoff list for every visit. Respondent said those checklists were prepared electronically, but Respondent did not include that information as part of the treatment records Respondent kept in her file cabinet.
- 81. The investigator asked Respondent in what way another acupuncturist would know how to treat her patients without any documentation in the patient's records. In response Respondent stated another acupuncturist would ask the patient what treatment the patient needed. Respondent told the investigator that other acupuncturists worked at her office when Respondent was not present and sometimes would call Respondent and ask her what treatment the patient needed.
- 82. Respondent stated she had problems with properly documenting the patients' treatment records but her main concern is the patient and not the documentation.
- 83. Respondent stated that while she was treating the patients from the December 21, 2012, accident she learned some of the patients had gone to an orthopedic surgeon for surgery without telling her. Respondent stated some of the patients returned to her practice after undertaking surgery because they were still in pain and insisted that she treat them after surgery. Respondent stated she did not determine the kind of surgery the patients had undergone. Nonetheless Respondent continued to treat the patients for pain despite the fact that the surgery which had been performed was intended to eliminate the patient's pain.
- 84. When the investigator asked Respondent if she referred the patients to their primary care physician to be treated for chronic pain Respondent stated she had done so. However, Respondent also said the patients would return to her practice to be treated for pain.

- 85. The investigator asked if Respondent had documentation which reflected her recommendations to the patients to return to the primary care physician for a physical evaluation and/or additional tests. Respondent stated she did not document counseling these patients to return to the primary care physician for a physical evaluation and/or additional tests. Respondent stated she just remembered that she told the patients to return to their primary care physician.
- 86. Respondent stated she did not confirm in any way that patients went to their doctors for the evaluation and testing she allegedly recommended but just trusted that the patient consulted with their primary care physician
- 87. The investigator reviewed the summary reports for each of the nine patients
 Respondent provided to the Board and subsequently brought to the interview. Respondent
 admitted the reports in each patient's file were written from her recollection and the billing codes.
 The following patients were discussed:
- 88. The records for Patient 1, a 70-year-old male who Respondent treated January 2, 2013, to February 8, 2013, contained a "Discharge Report," a sign in sheet, and billing records.
- 89. Patient 1's records disclosed that on January 2, 2013, Respondent performed an "Initial Exam" billed as CPT 99201, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. During the interview, Respondent said Patient 1 complained of neck, headache, knee, and lower back pain on the initial visit. The records contained a very small handwritten notation on "1/25/13" that stated "neck 15%, back 15-25%" [sic] and Respondent stated those notes meant the patient's neck had 15% movement, and he had 15 to 25% movement in his back. On "2/8/13," she noted "pain is better neck and back" [sic].
- 90. Patient 1's records revealed January 25, 2013, and February 8, 2013, "Examinations" billed as CPT 99213 for which insurance was billed \$100. Patient 1's records reflected Respondent billed for 11 treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot pack billed as CPT 97010 and massage billed as CPT 97124. Patient 1 was discharged on February 8, 2013, but Respondent's discharge report was dated March 25, 2013.
- 91. There was no documentation to support any of Respondent's billing for Patient 1. The total amount billed for these treatments was \$2,035.00.

- 92. A review of Patient 2's records reflected the 74-year-old female patient was treated January 2, 2013, to June 28, 2013. Patient 2's records disclosed that on January 2, 2013, Respondent performed an "Initial Exam" billed for this patient as CPT 99203, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. Respondent's "Acupuncture Treatment Record" recorded Patient 2 had "20% neck movement and 25% back movement" [sic] The appointment summary for a number of Patient 2's appointments had different dates than Patient 2's "Acupuncture Treatment Record." The records show Patient 2 signed the record, but the date had been crossed out. Respondent said it was an error and was not sure why Patient 2 signed there. Patient 2's records reflected 53 treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot pack billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124. Patient 2 was discharged on June 28, 2013, but Respondent's discharge report was dated July 10, 2013.
- 93. There was no documentation to support any of Respondent's billing for Patient 2. The total amount billed for these treatments was \$8,370.00.
- 94. A review of Patient 3's records reflected the 59-year-old female patient was treated December 22, 2012, to December 13, 2013. Patient 3's records disclosed that on December 22, 2012, Respondent performed an "Initial Exam" billed as CPT 99203, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. Patient 3's records show that on February 29, 2013, April 23, 2013, and June 6, 201, Respondent performed "Examinations" billed for \$100.00.
- 95. Patient 3's "Statement of Professional Service" show that on March 6, 2013, Respondent billed for a medical report, acupuncture, hot packs, and massage. However, the "Acupuncture Treatment Record" does not show that Patient 3 received any treatment on that date. Respondent stated the discrepancies in Patient 3's medical records were documentation errors.
- 96. Patient 3's records disclosed that between December 22, 2012, and June 28, 2013, the patient was allegedly treated 80 times with acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, with hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124. Patient 3 was discharged on June 28, 2013, but Respondent's discharge report for Patient 3 was dated September 6, 2013. There was no supporting documentation for the 80 treatments. The total

amount billed for the 80 treatments was \$12,140.00.

- 97. Respondent stated Patient 3 complained of pain and wanted to be treated daily.

 Respondent stated that she continued to treat Patient 3 because the treatment provided Patient 3 with pain relief. Respondent stated she thought she referred Patient 3 to the patient's primary care physician but couldn't remember the details of the conversation because of the lapse of time. Respondent then stated from her experience she would refer a patient to a Western medicine doctor or physical therapist if the patient continued to complain of pain.
- 98. Respondent stated Patient 3 had surgery but she still came to Respondent for treatment. Patient 3's records disclosed Respondent treated her 22 more times after surgery with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, with hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124. The total amount billed for the additional 22 treatments was \$3,190.00. Respondent said she would tell patients to get an x-ray or go to another doctor for an examination but Patient 3 never gave Respondent any documentation stating that she was evaluated by other doctors. Respondent stated patients just "like her treatment" which is why patients continue to treat with her for pain relief even after surgery to relieve the patient's pain.
- 99. On May 31, 2013, Respondent performed acupuncture treatment on Patient 3, the same day Patient 3 underwent surgery.
- 100. A review of Patient 4's records reflected the 48-year-old female patient was treated from January 2, 2013, to November 15, 2013. Patient 4's records reflected on January 2, 2013, Respondent performed an "Initial Exam" billed as CPT 99203, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. Patient 4's records reflected on February 19, 2013, April 11 and 23, 2013, Respondent performed "Examinations" billed as CPT 99213 for \$100 each which were included in the bill without supporting documentation.
- 101. In addition, Patient 4's records reflect that Patient 4 received treatments two or three days in a row on multiple occasions. Respondent provided 65 treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, with hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 which were billed for a total of \$9,965.00, without any supporting documentation. During her interview with the investigator Respondent stated Patient 4 had pain issues and needed

102. Respondent stated she told Patient 4 to go to her primary care physician to see if she needed physical therapy. However, Respondent stated that she does not follow-up with patients to make sure they see their doctor nor does she contact the patients' doctors to ensure the patients went to them for evaluation. Respondent stated Patient 4 informed Respondent that her doctor recommended she continue acupuncture. Respondent did not have any documentation from the Patient 4's doctors which recommended acupuncture treatment.

103. Respondent's "Discharge Report" for Patient 4" stated Patient 4 was discharged May 31, 2013, although the only "Discharge Report" prepared by Respondent was dated August 25, 2013. After Respondent initially discharged Patient 4 on May 31, 2013, Respondent allegedly performed 19 additional acupuncture treatments with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 between June 14, 2013, and November 15, 2013, for an additional \$2,755.00.

104. A review of Patient 5's records reflected the 72-year-old male patient was treated December 22, 2012, to July 29, 2013. Patient 5's records reflected on December 22, 2012, Respondent performed an "Initial Exam" billed as CPT 99203, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. Patient 5's records reflected on February 28, 2013, May 1, 2013, and July 29, 2013, Respondent performed "Examinations" billed as CPT 99213 for \$100 each which were included in the bill without supporting documentation.

105. Patient 5's records reflected Respondent provided 80 treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 billed for a total of \$12,140.00, without supporting documentation. Patient 5 was discharged on July 29, 2013, but the patient's discharge report was dated August 20, 2013. After Respondent discharged Patient 5 Respondent allegedly performed 17 additional treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 between August 1, 2013, and December 15, 2013, for an additional \$2,465.00.

106. The records for Patient 6 examined by the investigator during Respondent's interview

included a detailed checklist with the exact treatments provided to Patient 6. A review of Patient 6's "Statement of Professional Service" rendered showed that Respondent billed for March 7, 2013. Although there was no detailed checklist for March 7, 2013, on the "Acupuncture Treatment Record" March 7, 2013, is listed along with the patient's signature. Similarly, the March 11, 2013, "Statement of Professional Service" rendered shows Respondent billed for treatment and the detailed checklist for March 11, 2013, indicates treatment was provided. However, Patient 6's signature was not on the "Acupuncture Treatment Records" for March 11, 2013.

107. A review of Patient 6's records reflected the 64 year-old female patient was treated from December 22, 2012, to May 23, 2013. Patient 6's records reflected that on December 22, 2012, Respondent performed an "Initial Exam" billed as CPT 99203, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. Patient 6's records reflected on February 13, 2013, April 4, 2013, and May 23, 2013, Respondent performed "Examinations" billed as CPT 99213 for \$100 each which were included in the bill without supporting documentation.

108. Patient 6's records reflected Respondent provided 61 treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 billed for a total of \$9,385.00, without supporting documentation. Patient 6 was discharged on May 23, 2013, but the patient's discharge report was dated August 20, 2013.

109. After Respondent discharged Patient 6, Respondent allegedly performed 12 additional treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 between June 6, 2013, and December 11, 2013, for an additional \$1,740.00.

110. Patient 6's records reflected the patient was last seen by Respondent on February 19, 2014, for a total of 81 visits. Patient 6's records revealed Respondent provided 65 identical treatments utilizing the exact same acupuncture points, as well as a second set of 16 identical treatments to the first set, which differed due to the inclusion of one additional point.

111. A review of Patient 7's records reflected the 56 year-old male patient was treated from December 22, 2012, to May 23, 2013. On December 22, 2012, Respondent performed an

"Initial Exam" billed as CPT 99203, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. Patient 7's records reflected on February 13, 2013, April 4, 2013, and May 23, 2013, Respondent performed "Examinations" billed as CPT 99213 for \$100 each which were included in the bill without supporting documentation.

- 112. Patient 7's records reflected Respondent provided 61 treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 billed for a total of \$9,385.00, without supporting documentation. Patient 7 was discharged on May 23, 2013, but Respondent's "Discharge Report" for Patient 7 was dated August 26, 2013.
- 113. After Respondent discharged Patient 7 Respondent allegedly performed 11 additional treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 between June 6, 2013, and October 24, 2013, for an additional \$1,595.00.
- 114. A review of Patient 8's records reflected the 74 year-old, female patient was treated from December 22, 2012, to May 23, 2013. On December 22, 2012, Respondent performed an "Initial Exam" billed as CPT 99203, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. Patient 8's records reflected on February 13, 2013, April 4, 2013, and May 23, 2013, Respondent performed "Examinations" billed as CPT 99213 for \$100 each which were included in the bill without supporting documentation.
- 115. Patient 8's records reflected Respondent provided 58 treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 which were billed for a total of \$8,950.00, without supporting documentation. Patient 8 was discharged on May 23, 2013, and the patient's discharge report was dated May 30, 2013.
- 116. After Respondent discharged Patient 8 Respondent allegedly performed 10 additional treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 between June 6, 2013, and December 7, 2013, for an additional \$1,450.00.
 - 117. The records for Patient 9 examined by the investigator during Respondent's interview

revealed signatures signed on lines that had no corresponding date. Also, the records included dates that Patient 9 was ostensibly treated which did not have a signature associated with the treatment date. Respondent stated the discrepancies in Patient 9's medical records were documentation errors.

- 118. A review of Patient 9's records reflected the 59 year-old, female patient was treated from January 2, 2013, to January 31, 2013. On January 2, 2013, Respondent performed an "Initial Exam" billed as CPT 99203, for which insurance was billed \$140.00. Patient 9's records reflected on January 22, 2013, and January 31, 2013, Respondent performed "Examinations" billed as CPT 99213 for \$100 each which were included in the bill without supporting documentation.
- 119. Patient 9's records reflected Respondent provided 9 treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 which were billed for a total of \$1,745.00, without supporting documentation. Patient 9 was discharged on January 31, 2013, but the patient's discharge report was dated February 24, 2013.
- 120. After Respondent discharged Patient 9, Respondent allegedly performed 4 additional treatments of acupuncture with electric-stimulation billed as CPT 97813, with hot packs billed as CPT 97010, and massage billed as CPT 97124 between March 15, 2013, and April 19, 2013, for an additional \$580.00.
- 121. Each set of records contained a patient signed form titled "Patient Info Sheet" which stated: "Note: insurance forms will be completed by this office, however, the patient is personally responsible for payment of all the services rendered. Assignment. . . I understand that I am responsible for any amount not covered by insurance."
- 122. During Respondent's interview with the investigator, Respondent provided a number of explanations of the discrepancies in the patients' treatments dates, such as the patient requested to be seen the next day or the patient had complained that they did not want to wait until the next week for their next treatment or some patients did not want to travel to her other office to receive treatment so she would allow them to come back the next day for the same treatment.

- 123. Respondent explained she had completed most of the patients' treatments when Attorney 1 requested the patients' treatment records. Based on her conversation with Attorney 1 Respondent stated she believed Attorney 1 would submit the billing for the patients' treatments and pay her at the conclusion of the lawsuits. Respondent stated she subsequently learned the patients did not win the lawsuit and she was not paid for the patients' treatment. Respondent stated she did not bill the patients because the payment was supposed to come from Attorney 1.
- 124. Respondent stated Attorney 1 informed her she had to appear for a deposition. Respondent stated she was not given information regarding the subject of the deposition and did not have legal representation. Attorney 1 told Respondent that she needed to get her own attorney because he was only representing the patients.
 - 125. Respondent stated that she had no contact with Attorney 1 after the depositions.
- 126. The investigator obtained various records and billing statements from Dr. 1 for several patients involved in the December 21, 2012, accident. The records included a statement for Patient 3. The investigator also obtained three depositions from Dr. 1 taken September 24, 2014, January 28, 2015, and April 16, 2015, regarding his care and treatment of various patients injured in the December 21, 2012, accident.
- 127. During his first two depositions Dr. 1 testified he performed surgery on six of the patients injured in the December 21, 2012, accident. Dr. 1 testified he would not recommend acupuncture after having surgery and did not believe in acupuncture treatments.
- 128. With regards to the Patient 7, Dr. 1 stated there was an error in his report of September 16, 2013, and made a handwritten change to the report.

STANDARD OF CARE

- 129. The standard of care for recordkeeping requires the acupuncturist to keep complete, detailed and accurate records for each patient to whom the acupuncturist provides treatment. Those records must include, but are not limited to, the following information: the date of treatment (s), the type of treatments given and the patient's progression or regression as a result of the acupuncturist's treatments.
 - 130. Respondent's medical records did not provide proper documentation for her patients'

treatments and constitute an extreme departure from the standard of care.

- 131. Respondent's medical records contained acupuncture reports written by Respondent's husband based on Respondent's memory of patient treatment which reports were often prepared months after the patient was discharged and these records constitute an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 132. Respondent's medical records did not provide documentation of any referrals to other medical providers and that failure constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 133. The standard of care for recordkeeping with regard to billing requires the acupuncturist to keep complete, detailed, and accurate records on each patient who is given treatment for which the patient is billed.
- 134. Respondent's medical records displayed numerous examples of billing errors where patients' charts were signed by the patient for treatment on a particular date for which no billing was submitted or where the patient did not sign the record to acknowledge receipt of treatment for a particular date but was billed for treatment allegedly provided on that date and this inappropriate recordkeeping constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 135. Respondent's medical records depicted over 540 treatments she allegedly performed and for which she billed, which records utilized the exact same codes, regardless of each separate patients' prior medical history, age, injuries, or complaints. This inappropriate recordkeeping constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 136. Respondent's medical records repeatedly demonstrated inaccurate billing codes for Respondent's patients' treatments which Respondent admitted were incorrect based on the treatment she allegedly provided to the patient and this inappropriate recordkeeping constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 137. Public safety necessitates any provider performing a medical procedure be properly trained in the performance of such procedure. Therefore, the standard of care requires the acupuncturist to utilize only licensed providers to provide patient care such as massage and manipulation.
 - 138. Based on the patients' records Respondent in fact employed unlicensed providers to

perform massage and manipulation treatments for the patients in contrast to Respondent's sworn deposition testimony as well as the statements she made to the investigator during her interviews. Respondent's employment of unlicensed providers to perform massage and manipulation treatments for her patients constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.

- 139. The standard of care for an acupuncturist who provides continuing care to patients requires the acupuncturist to document specific, measurable, progressive, significant, or objective functional improvements regarding the acupuncture provided to the patient in previous sessions to support the reasonableness and necessity of any additional acupuncture beyond an initial trial of six to eight sessions.
- 140. The standard of care for the acupuncturist who provides continuing care to patients requires the acupuncturist to provide additional treatments only if the patient demonstrated progressively greater, incremental, objective gains.
- 141. The standard of care for the acupuncturist who provides continuing care to patients requires the acupuncturist to discontinue patient care if the patient's condition resolves, the patient can no longer tolerate treatment, the patient exhibits a lack of measurable improvement, or the patient is non-compliant with the acupuncturist's direction regarding exercises or other suggested measures.
- 142. Respondent's patients' medical records did not illustrate specific, measurable, progressive, significant, or objective functional improvements as a result of the acupuncture treatments Respondent provided which supported the reasonableness and necessity of any additional acupuncture beyond an initial trial of six to eight sessions; the continued therapy for the patient therefore constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 143. The standard of care for the acupuncturist regarding referrals from medical and legal providers requires referrals to the acupuncturist from medical and legal providers be based on medical necessity.
- 144. The standard of care for the acupuncturist regarding a referral from one medical provider to another mandates that the referral be done based on the need to properly diagnose and/or treat a patient due to severity of the symptoms, the need for specific set of skills required

(consultation with a specialist) and/or due to the lack of progression in their condition with the treatment rendered thus far, among other reasons.

- 145. The standard of care for the acupuncturist regarding a referral to the acupuncturist from medical and legal providers shall be based only on medical necessity not financial interest.
- 146. Respondent's patients' medical records exposed a pattern whereby the nine patients referred to her from the December 21, 2012, accident went directly to Respondent without a consultation with their own primary care physicians and/or a referral from same. Those patients were instead referred to Respondent by one of the same providers (e.g., the MRI facility, the patients' attorney, and/or physician) from at least one previous case where the Respondent was a party in a motor vehicle accident. The pattern of patient referral described above constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 147. Respondent's patients' records demonstrate the patients' failure to consult with their primary care physician prior to receiving care from Respondent, Respondent's failure to properly diagnose and/or treat the patients, Respondent's failure to refer the patients for consultation with a specialist after their failure to progress after her numerous treatments, and Respondent's extensive billing for services allegedly rendered. Thus, those referrals between these professionals appeared to have been made with the intent of defrauding the insurance company. The pattern of patient referral behavior shown by Respondent and the other professionals referred to above constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 148. The standard of care for the acupuncturist regarding the acupuncturist's policy on patient payment versus payment forgiveness for acupuncture services not reimbursed by insurance requires the acupuncturist to attempt reimbursement from the patient for those portions of the bill left unpaid by insurance.
- 149. Respondent patients' records fail to document any attempt to collect the portion of patients' bills unpaid by insurance. Under these circumstances Respondent's routine forgiveness of the portion unpaid by insurance appears to constitute fraud and constitute an extreme departure from the standard of care.

//

CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence)

- 150. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under 4955.2, subsection (a), in that she was grossly negligent in her care and treatment of nine patients for injuries which resulted from a crash between a bus and a car. The circumstances are as follows:
- 151. Complainant refers to, and by reference incorporates herein paragraphs 16 through 149, inclusive, above.
- 152. Respondent's care and treatment of patient's one through nine as set forth above includes the following acts and/or omissions which constitute extreme departures from the standard of care:
- A. Respondent's medical records did not provide proper documentation for her patients' treatments.
- B. Respondent's medical records contained acupuncture reports written by Respondent's husband based on Respondent's memory of patient treatment which reports were often prepared months after the patient was discharged.
- C. Respondent's medical records did not provide documentation of any referrals to other medical providers.
- D. Respondent's medical records displayed numerous examples of billing errors where patients' charts were signed by the patient for treatment on a particular date for which no billing was submitted or where the patient did not sign the record to acknowledge receipt of treatment for a particular date but were billed for treatment allegedly provided on that date.
- E. Respondent's medical records depicted over 540 treatments for which she allegedly performed and billed which utilized the exact same codes, regardless of each separate patient's prior medical history, age, injuries, or complaints.
- F. Respondent's medical records repeatedly demonstrated inaccurate billing codes for Respondent's patient treatments which Respondent admitted were incorrect based on the treatment she allegedly provided to the patient.
 - G. Respondent's employed unlicensed providers to perform massage and manipulation

treatments for her patients.

- H. Respondent's patients' medical records did not illustrate specific, measurable, progressive, significant, or objective functional improvements as a result of the acupuncture treatments Respondent provided which supported the reasonableness and necessity of any additional acupuncture beyond an initial trial of six to eight sessions.
- I. Respondent's patients' medical records exposed a pattern whereby the nine patients referred to her from the December 21, 2012, accident went directly to Respondent without a consultation with their own primary care physicians and/or a referral from same but were instead referred to Respondent by one of the same providers (e.g., the MRI facility, the patients' attorney, and physician) from at least one previous case there the Respondent was a party in a motor vehicle accident.
- J. Respondent's patients' records show the patients' failure to consult with their primary care physician prior to receiving care from Respondent, Respondent's failure to properly diagnose and/or treat patients, Respondent's failure to refer patients for consultation with a specialist after their failure to progress after her numerous treatments, and the extensive billing for services allegedly rendered demonstrate that the patient referrals between these professionals appeared to have been made with the intent of defrauding the insurance company.
- K. Respondent patients' records fail to document any attempt to collect the portion of patients' bills which were unpaid by insurance. Under these circumstances Respondent's routine forgiveness of the portion unpaid by insurance appears to constitute fraud.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 153. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4955.2, subdivision (b), of the Code, in that she has committed repeated acts of negligence in the practice of acupuncture. The circumstances are as follows:
- 154. Complainant refers to, and by reference incorporates herein paragraphs 16 through 149, inclusive, above.
 - 155. Respondent's care and treatment of patient's one through nine as set forth above

includes the following acts and/or omissions which constitute departures from the standard of care:

- A. Respondent's medical records did not provide proper documentation for her patients' treatments.
- B. Respondent's medical records contained acupuncture reports written by Respondent's husband based on Respondent's memory of patient treatment which reports were often prepared months after the patient was discharged.
- C. Respondent's medical records did not provide documentation of any referrals to other medical providers.
- D. Respondent's medical records displayed numerous examples of billing errors where patients' charts were signed by the patient for treatment on a particular date for which no billing was submitted or where the patient did not sign the record to acknowledge receipt of treatment for a particular date but were billed for treatment allegedly provided on that date.
- E. Respondent's medical records depicted over 540 treatments for which she allegedly performed and billed which utilized the exact same codes, regardless of each separate patient's prior medical history, age, injuries, or complaints.
- F. Respondent's medical records repeatedly demonstrated inaccurate billing codes for Respondent's patient treatments which Respondent admitted were incorrect based on the treatment she allegedly provided to the patient.
- G. Respondent's employed unlicensed providers to perform massage and manipulation treatments for her patients.
- H. Respondent's patients' medical records did not illustrate specific, measurable, progressive, significant, or objective functional improvements as a result of the acupuncture treatments Respondent provided which supported the reasonableness and necessity of any additional acupuncture beyond an initial trial of six to eight sessions.
- I. Respondent's patients' medical records exposed a pattern whereby the 28 patients referred to her from the bus and car crash went directly to Respondent without a consultation with their own primary care physicians and/or a referral from same but were instead referred to

Respondent by one of the same providers (e.g., the MRI facility, the patients' attorney, and physician) from at least one previous case there the Respondent was a party in a motor vehicle accident.

- J. Respondent's patients' records show the patients' failure to consult with their primary care physician prior to receiving care from Respondent, Respondent's failure to properly diagnose and/or treat patients, Respondent's failure to refer patients for consultation with a specialist after their failure to progress after her numerous treatments, and the extensive billing for services allegedly rendered demonstrate that the patient referrals between these professionals appeared to have been made with the intent of defrauding the insurance company.
- K. Respondent patients' records fail to document any attempt to collect the portion of patients' bills which were unpaid by insurance. Under these circumstances Respondent's routine forgiveness of the portion unpaid by insurance appears to constitute fraud.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Records)

- 156. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4955, as defined by section 4955.1, subdivision (e), in that she failed to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to the services she provided to patients one through nine. The circumstances are as follows:
- 157. Complainant refers to, and by reference incorporates herein paragraphs 16 through 149, inclusive, above.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Fraud)

- 158. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 810, subdivision (a), as defined by section 810, subdivision (a)(1)(2)(b), in that she knowingly presented or caused to be presented false or fraudulent claims for the payment of a loss under a contract of insurance and/or knowingly prepared, made, or subscribed any writing, with intent to present or use the same, or to allow it to be presented or used in support of any false or fraudulent claim. The circumstances are as follows:
 - 159. Complainant refers to, and by reference incorporates herein paragraphs 16 through

1	149, inclusive, above.
2	FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
3	(Committing A Fraudulent Act)
4	160. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 4955.2, subdivisions (b),
5	(c), (d), and (e), and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1399.453 for creating false
6	medical records of her care and treatment of patients one through nine. The circumstances are as
7	follows:
8	161. Complainant refers to, and by reference incorporates herein paragraphs 16 through
9	149, inclusive, above.
10	SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
11	(Unprofessional Conduct)
12	162. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4955.1, subdivision (e), of
13	the Code, and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1399.453, in that She committed
14	unprofessional conduct in her care and treatment of patients one through nine. The circumstances
15	are as follows:
16	163. Complainant refers to, and by reference incorporates herein paragraphs 16 through
17	160, inclusive, above.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	22

PRAYER 1 2 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Acupuncture Board issue a decision: 3 Revoking or suspending Acupuncturist Respondent License Number AC 6715, issued 4 1. 5 to Ning Li, L.Ac., 2. Ordering Ning Li, L.Ac. to pay the Acupuncture Board the reasonable costs of the 6 7 investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4959, 8 3 If placed on probation, ordering her to pay to the Acupuncture Board the costs of 9 probation monitoring, and; 10 4 Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 11 12 13 14 DATED: May 28, 2020 Original Signature on File 15 **BENJAMIN BODEA Executive Officer** 16 Acupuncture Board Department of Consumer Affairs 17 State of California Complainant 18 LA2020500627 19 63315246.docx 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 33