BEFORE THE BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS STATE OF OREGON

2	STATE OF OREGON				
. 3					
4	In the Matter of) STIPULATED FINAL ORDER				
5	Braxton Nguyen, DC) Case # 2011-2002, 2011-3034				
6	Licensee) and 2011-5017				
7	The Board of Chiropractic Examiners (Board) is the state agency responsible for licensing, regulating and disciplining chiropractic physicians in the State of Oregon.				
8	Braxton Nguyen, DC (Licensee), is licensed by the Board to practice as a chiropractic physician in the State of Oregon. The Board proposes to discipline Licensee for the following reasons.				
10	FINDINGS OF FACT				
11	1.				
12	The Board received a complaint alleging that Licensee's records had violations of				
13	billing, coding, inaccurate records and lack of clinical justification in the chart notes. In response to a complaint, the Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners directed the Peer Review Committee (PRC) to review the complaint with Licensee. The PRC reviewed 17 patient chart notes and billing records totaling over 5700 pages.				
14					
15	2.				
16	Licensee was interviewed by the Peer Review Committee in August 2012 regarding the allegations above and his treatment of Patients 1-13.				
17	3.				
18	The investigation and interviews concerning Patients 1-2 and 4-7 revealed the				
19	following findings:				
20	a. As to Patient 1, some of Licensee's chart notes and forms lacked clinic identifiers. This violates OAR 811-015-0005(1)(b). Licensee has updated his software				
21	program and forms to include clinic identifiers.				
22	Licensee's chart notes did not document therapeutic exercises, with billing code 97110, in enough detail to evidence clinical justification for the procedures. This violates				
23	OAR 811-015-0005(1) and OAR 811-015-0010(1).				
25	Licensee failed to record in his chart note the diagnostic necessity of not utilizing thyroid shielding during x-rays. This violates OAR 811-030-0020(7) and OAR 811-030-0030(2)(d).				
!					

811-030-0020(7) and OAR 811-030-0030(2)(d). 2 As to Patient 4, Licensee failed to include additional documentation, 3 beyond his Criteria Prescription regarding his clinical justification for recommended decompression treatment in his chart notes. This violates OAR 811-015-0010(1). As to Patient 5, Licensee failed to include additional documentation concerning his clinical justification for spinal decompression treatment. This violates 5 OAR 811-015-0010(1). 6 As to Patient 6, Licensee's initial treatment plan reported general guidelines for treatment for the patient's injuries and should have been more specifically 7 tailored to treatment of a two year old. All of the treatment modalities listed, although not used, would have been inappropriate if provided to a two year old. This patient received 8 59 treatments over five and a half months. The PRC felt this number of treatments for a two year required additional documentation of clinical justification. This violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(B), OAR 811-015-0005(1)(a), OAR 811-015-0010(1) and (4). 10 As to Patient 7, Licensee failed to document the specific regions of intersegmental traction provided to the patient. This violates OAR 811-015-0005(1)(a). 1 l· Patient 7 was a passenger in a car struck while traveling on the freeway. Licensee treated Patient 7 aggressively for six months, but discontinued treatment when Patient 7 could no longer afford care. Patient 7 had marked findings on the closing exam. Licensee 13 indicated in his closing notes the patient had continued impairments and would need ongoing supportive and maintenance treatment. Licensee's chart notes indicate Patient 7 had reached a level of maximum medical improvement with respect to certain conditions, 15 which appeared inconsistent with his other findings without further explanation. Licensee's documentation was inadequate to explain Patient 7's election to discontinue treatment. This violates OAR 811-015-0005(1) and OAR 811-015-0010(1). 16 In some cases, Licensee failed to making appropriate designations in his 17 chart concerning diagnostic necessity on increased collimation or lack of gonadal or thyroid shielding during x-rays. This violates OAR 811-030-0020(7) and OAR 811-030-18 0030(2)(d). 19 The PRC felt that Licensee overused the code D0004 for translation. Licensee has since discontinued using translation codes during treatment where a 20 bilingual CA is present. This violates OAR 811-035-0015(2) 21 22 The investigation of Patient 8 revealed the following findings: 23 Patient 8 treated with Licensee from February through June 2010 after a motor vehicle accident. She complained of neck, mid and low back pain, and bilateral shoulder 24 pain, greater on the left. Licensee ordered an MRI of her lumbar are on May 19, 2010. The radiologist noted a finding of hydronephrosis. Licensee failed to report this finding 25 in his chart or his subsequent discussion of the finding with the patient and his subsequent referral of the patient to her medical doctor. Licensee did submit to the Board

the testimony of two employees, who confirm that Licensee did discuss the MRI report

4

26

As to Patient 2, Licensee failed to record in his chart note the diagnostic

necessity of not utilizing gonadal or thyroid shielding during x-rays. This violates OAR

with the patient, provide her with a copy and instruct her to see her doctor. In addition, the employees confirm he continued to ask the patient if she had seen her doctor. However, Licensee failed to document his continued efforts.

In addition, Licensee failed to timely change his computer notes to reflect that plaintiff's abdominal surgery had taken place. Although Licensee's hand written note for June 14, 2010 reflected he knew plaintiff's surgery had occurred, his unrevised version of his June 14, 2010 computerized chart note stated "prognosis for her thoraco-lumbar region is fair to guarded and is complicated by a benign tumor that will be removed surgically very soon. The benign tumor has been closely monitored by her M.D." Licensee subsequently revised his chart note to reflect the current history.

Licensee's August 9, 2010 chart note indicated the patient's condition had been hindered by frequent exacerbations post-surgery and residual scar tissue formation made her prognosis fair to guarded. Due to the seriousness of the patient's post-surgical condition, Licensee should have documented his initial and continuing instructions to the patient in the chart and formal referral to her treating physician.

The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-015-0005(1)(a), OAR 811-015-0010(1), (2) and (4).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

5.

On November 15, 2012, the Board considered and adopted the report of the Peer Review Committee finding Licensee in violation of ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR811-015-0005(1), OAR 811-015-0010(1), (2) and (4), OAR 811-035-0015(2), OAR 811-030-0030(2)(d), OAR 811-030-0020(7) and violating Oregon Chiropractic Practice and Utilization Guidelines for providing excessive care without additional supporting documentation.

STIPULATIONS

6.

Therefore, pursuant to ORS 684.100(9)(b), (f) and (g) the OBCE orders:

- 1. The parties have agreed to enter this stipulated final order. Licensee agrees to the entering of this final order. Licensee agrees that he is aware of his right to a hearing with his attorney present to contest the charges and hereby waives that right and agrees to entry of this order. The signature of this order also waives any right to appeal. The parties wish to settle and resolve the above matter without further proceedings
- 2. Licensee will pay a \$10,000 civil penalty to the OBCE, payable within 180 days of this order becoming final.
- 3. Licensee is given five years of probation which begins when this order becomes final.

2

3

4

5

.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

2324

25

I I	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	e. Any other event that Licensee receives permission from the OBCE to attend.
2	9. The Board agrees to waive any costs on this matter.
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED AND AGREED TO:
4	DATED this 29 TH day of May, 2013.
5	Original Signatures are on file in OBCE office
6	By: Braxton Nguyen, DC
7	DATED this 28 day of May, 2013.
8	BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS
9	Original Signatures are on file in OBCE office
10	By: Dave McTeague, Executive Director
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

BEFORE THE 1 **BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS** 2 STATE OF OREGON 3 5 6 In the Matter of NOTICE OF PROPOSED 7 DISCIPLINARY ACTION . Braxton Nguyen DC 9 10 Case # 2011-2002 and 2011-3034 Licensee. 11 12 The Board of Chiropractic Examiners (Board) is the state agency responsible for 13 licensing, regulating and disciplining chiropractic physicians in the State of Oregon. Braxton 14 Nguyen DC (Licensee) is licensed by the Board to practice as a chiropractic physician in the 15 State of Oregon. The Board proposes to discipline Licensee for the following reasons. 16 17 18 The Board received a complaint alleging that Licensee's records had violations of billing, 19 coding, inaccurate records and lack of clinical justification in the chart notes. In response to a 20 complaint, the Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners directed the Peer Review Committee 21 (PRC) to review the complaint with Licensee. The PRC reviewed 17 patient chart notes, billing 22 23 records totaling over 5700 pages. 24 2. 25 Licensee was interviewed by the Peer Review Committee in August 2012 regarding the 26 allegations above and his treatment of Patients 1-13. 27 28 3. 29 The investigation and interviews revealed the following information: 30 31 1. In regards to Patient 1, the records showed no clinic identifiers were found on pages 32 389-391 and 395-403. Therapeutic exercise billing code 97110 was used 28 times of the 41 33 treatment dates and lacked the minimal information in the notes to justify the procedures. 34 Electrical stimulus code 97014 was used 29 of the 41 treatment dates and this modality code can 35 only be billed if the area treated is not in a region that has received spinal manipulation. This is a 36 37 bundling violation in terms of the billing. The PRC found that a consult code of 99211 on date of service 3/29/11 for handing out a cold pack was not appropriate, nor clinically justified. The 38 therapeutic exercise code 97530 for date of service 6/23/11 for take home exercise instructions 39 was inappropriate, as the CPT defines therapeutic activities as direct patient contact by the 40

provider. The final exam performed on 9/2/11 stated all areas at maximum medical

improvement without findings on the closing exam. However, on that same date, the patient

41

received a 3-4 region spinal manipulation, electrical stimulation, ice pack and four units of massage when the patient had no symptoms. On 2/17/11 x-rays were taken of the cervical spine (3 of them) and lumbar spine (4 of them) with only moderate findings on the initial exam of an 11 year old child. The films show no shielding of gonadal or thyroid areas and lack appropriate collimation. This is grossly inappropriate with the age of this patient lacking significant findings.

The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-015-0005(1), OAR 811-015-0010(1),(2), (3) and (4), OAR 811-035-0015(2) and OAR 811-030-0030(2)(a)-(n), OAR 811-030-0020(7) and OAR 333-106-0030.

2. In regards to Patient 2, this patient had x rays and there was no shielding and inappropriate collimation.

The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-030-0030(a)-(n) and OAR 811-030-0020(7).

3. Patient 3 received treatment on 9/29/10 and was billed an E0230 code for ice cap or collar with no explanation on the SOAP note. Review of records also found that this patient was billed L0628 for lumbosacral orthosis with straps, but no mention in the notes. Billing for the date of service 10/5/10 and 11/5/10 was omitted. This patient was billed a 99201 but the notes do not support this billing code. (Page 4401). A re-exam was billed as a 99213 for this patient but it did not include a past or present history on this patient. This patient was billed a code 99211, and by explanation on the take home sheet appears to be a pillow support or wedge for a chair. Billing for low level laser therapy at a 97032 code was in the chart and was not supported. On 10/29/10 an exam was done showing no positive neurologic findings, yet the patient reports he is staying the same. The exam sheet says patient had a positive Soto Hall. On pages 4437-4439 of the notes there is a Rx for decompression by this practitioner but no soap note to explain clinical justification. This was billed as a S9090 defined as vertebral axial decompression and was billed \$200 per session. There were notes regarding this patient having a MRI, yet the notes contained no clinical justification for a cervical MRI to be requested.

The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-015-0005(1), OAR 811-015-0010(1), (2), (3) and (4), OAR 811-035-0015(2).

4. As to Patient 5, chart notes indicate on page 619 that the day after an acute injury it was suggested this patient apply heat to all regions. The PRC felt this was inappropriate. This patient was also given multiple orthotic supports, a pillow, an ice pack, heat pack and thermobrace and the chart notes did not appear to provide clinical justification for this to occur. A billing code of 97014 for electrical stim over spinal regions was given with adjusting all regions, without using a modifier of -59. 7 different views of the cervical and 4 of the lumbar were done via x-rays with moderate complaints and absent significant findings and no radicular symptoms. The PRC felt that was excessive x-ray exposure. On page 656 the Soap note indicates the patient was in constant moderate pain, and yet noted she was improving. On page

656 the patient was given supervised resistance exercise for the neck and back. However, the exercise sheet lacked certain information. The log was provided but only listed the region and repetition. On re exam Licensee ordered a MRI on lumbar spine, it showed mild changes and then an order for spinal decompression was also signed by Licensee. Decompression on each OV after MRI at \$200 was found by PRC to be questionable.

The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-015-0005(1), OAR 811-015-0010(1),(2), (3) and (4), OAR 811-035-0015(2) and OAR 811-030-0030(2)(a)-(n), OAR 811-030-0020(7) and OAR 333-106-0030.

5. Patient 6, a 2 year old male appeared with neck, mid and low back pain rated at a 6, yet the notes don't explain how this patient communicated that to the practitioner. The chart notes state the patient has trouble dressing himself, yet he's two years old. Notes also said he had trouble standing for more than one hour; PRC noted the patient was two years of age. The treatment plan on this patient was to provide chiropractic adjustment, myofascial trigger point physiotherapy, muscle stimulation, intersegmental traction, therapeutic exercise, and therapeutic massage. The PRC found all modalities on a two year old are inappropriate if not impossible. A 3/25/10 EMG occurred, but there were no dates on the file, and this is a standing unaided test with most readings off the chart note. PRC found that this was a highly questionable test and most likely an invalid test. This child received a total of 59 treatments and the PRC felt a two year old with questionable clinical rational was over treated by Licensee.

The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-015-0005(1), OAR 811-015-0010(1),(2), (3) and (4), OAR 811-035-0015(2).

6. Patient 7 was billed a 97012 for several visits in April and May 2010 and the specific region was not noted in the charts. There were multiple charges for code 99211 for dispensing of ice, heat pack, pillow and a brace without clinical justification in the charts. PRC found that this patient treated aggressively with this Licensee for 6 months then treatment suddenly stops with Licensee saying the patient had reached maximum medical improvement, while there were marked findings on the closing exam (pages 3971-3975). There was inadequate explanation in the chart notes as to this patient's progress and reasons for treatment to cease.

The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-015-0005(1), OAR 811-015-0010(1),(2), (3) and (4), OAR 811-035-0015(2).

7. The PRC felt that Licensee overused the code D004 for translation that is routinely used throughout all files reviewed. The PRC felt that a translator fee may be reasonable in a consult, but not in a treatment when a bilingual CA is normally present.

The PRC also found that all x-rays reviewed showed they were lacking an adequate collimation and most were missing appropriate gonadal and thyroid shielding. There also appeared to be a pattern of referring the patients out for MRI without significant radicular

symptoms and no positive orthopedic or neurological exam findings as a means to prescribe the Axial Decompression.

The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-015-0005(1), OAR 811-015-0010(1),(2), (3) and (4), OAR 811-035-0015(2) and OAR 811-030-0030(2)(a)-(n), OAR 811-030-0020(7) and OAR 333-106-0030.

4.

On November 15, 2012, the Board considered and adopted the report of the Peer Review Committee finding Licensee in violation of The above violates ORS 684.100(1)(f)(A), OAR 811-015-0005(1), OAR 811-015-0010(1),(2), (3) and (4), OAR 811-035-0015(2) and OAR 811-030-0030()(a)-(n), OAR 811-030-0020(7) and OAR 333-106-0030 and violating Oregon Chiropractic Practice and Utilization Guidelines for providing excessive and possibly unnecessary care.

5.

Due to the aforementioned violations, the OBCE proposes to put Licensee on probation for five years in addition to the following provisions:

A. Licensee is required to be monitored by Affiliated Monitors for first three years of the probation period once the suspension has been served.

Licensee shall obtain an office compliance audit by Affiliated Monitors. Affiliated Monitors will determine the appropriate timing for this audit in consultation with the OBCE. The compliance auditor designated by Affiliated Monitors shall have demonstrated training and/or experience in determining whether a health care practitioner or facility is in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations that affect the provider in preparing and implementing compliance plans or programs for such providers.

The compliance auditor shall conduct a compliance audit and assessment of Licensee's chiropractic practice for the purpose of determining whether Licensee's practice is in satisfactory compliance with all applicable state laws, rules and regulations, including but not limited to the laws, rules and regulations which pertain to the delivery of, documentation of, and/or billing and payment for health care services. The audit and assessment will remain confidential between Licensee and Affiliated Monitors.

The compliance auditor shall develop a written Compliance Plan for Licensee, based on the results of the compliance audit and assessment, which identifies the specific preventative and correction action which Licensee has taken or will take in the future to ensure continuing satisfactory compliance with all applicable federal and state laws, rules and regulations. The Compliance Plan shall be released to the Board and Licensee shall execute all necessary releases.

The Compliance Plan shall address, at a minimum the following:

a. The establishment and implementation of written policies and procedures for all aspects of Licensee's practice, including office operations and administration, patient care, response to patient complaints or concerns, clinical record-keeping, confidentiality of patient records and access to such records, and billing and coding procedures;

- b. The exercise of due diligence with respect to hiring and retention of present and/or prospective employees, if any, and in the delegation of patient care functions to such personnel if applicable;
- c. The assurance that all present and/or prospective employees properly carry out their responsibilities under the Compliance Program, including the reporting of possible compliance problems to the Compliance Monitor;
 - d. The performance of periodic internal reviews as outlined in the above;
- e. The establishment and implementation of adequate procedures for investigating and facilitating appropriate corrective responses to identified compliance problems and patient complaints and concerns.

Licensee shall engage the services of Affiliated Monitors to serve as the Compliance Monitor to monitor Licensee's implementation of the Compliance Plan through a three year monitoring period, and to furnish the Board with written reports concerning Licensee's progress in implementing the Compliance Plan once every 90 days throughout the monitoring period. The frequency of monitoring visits will be determined by the Compliance Monitor in consultation with Affiliated Monitors and the Board, however the Board's expectation is that monitoring will be on a monthly basis for as long as the Compliance Monitor determines this to be needed during the probationary period.

30-

Licensee shall ensure that the Compliance Monitor conducts a complete and comprehensive administrative and clinical review of Licensee's chiropractic practice at least once every 90 days during the monitoring period, and submits to the Board a written report of the results of each such review. This administrative and clinical review shall identify any and all deficiencies in Licensee's administrative or clinical practices which, in the professional judgment of the Compliance Monitor shall provide a copy of each such report to Licensee. The Compliance Monitor is unable to complete this administrative and clinical review in a timely fashion due to the Compliance Monitor's own personal and professional commitments, Licensee and Compliance Monitor shall notify the Board in writing of the reasons why Compliance Monitor is unable to complete the review by that date, and the Board, for good cause shown, may extend the deadline for completion of that review and submission of the required report.

In a timely manner, Licensee shall take any and all corrective actions which are reasonably necessary to correct any and all deficiencies identified in any of the administrative and clinical reviews conducted by the Compliance Monitor.

Licensee expressly agrees that he shall be responsible for all costs and expenses associated with the Compliance Audit and Plan by Affiliated Monitors, and that the Board shall bear no responsibility or liability for the costs of those services.

The first such Compliance Report shall be due one hundred twenty days after the Compliance Plan is developed by Affiliated Monitors.

B. Licensee will be subjected to file pulls and reviews by the Board for the duration of the probation. Licensee shall allow a representative or agent of the Board to retrieve files and will allow the staff to make copies of the file for Board review.

F-1 FF1

4

ú

If Licensee fails to request a hearing within 30 days, or fails to appear as scheduled at the hearing, the OBCE may issue a final order by default and impose the above sanctions against Licensee. Upon default order of the Board or failure to appear, the contents of the Board's file regarding the subject of this automatically become part of the evidentiary record of this disciplinary action upon default for the purpose of proving a prima facie case.

7 8

DATED this 30th day of November 2012.

9 16 11

BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS
State of Oregon

77

Original Signatures are on file in OBCE office

14

 B_{L}

Dave McTeague, Executive Director

18

16

19 20

11 12 23

Ŀ	State of Oregon)	Case # 2011-2002 and 2011-3034		
3	County of Marion	}	Braxton Nguyen DC		
3-					
4					
5	I, Dave McTeague, being fi	rst duly swo m ,	state that I am the Executive Director of the		
6	Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners, and as such, am authorized to verify pleadings in thi				
7	case: and that the foregoing Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action is true to the best of my				
ß	knowledge as I verily believe.				
9		Original S	ignatures are on file in OBCE office		
JØ					
11			guc, Executive Director		
12 13		Oregon boar	d of Chiropractic Examiners		
14					
15					
16			ED AND SWORN to before me		
17	•	this	the day of November , 2012		
18					
		Original Signatur	es are on file in OBCE office		
19 30		NOTABYD	UBLIC FOR OREGON		
20: 21:			sion Expires: Dec. 5, 2015		
		-			
22 23		OFFICIAL SEAL			
24 24		HARI K BARRET ARY PUBLIC - ORE			
25	COM	AMISSION NO. 46 PIRES DECEMBER	DS 2015		
26	(MY COMMISSION E				
27					

1					
2	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE				
3					
4	I, Dave McTeague, certify that on November 30, 2012. I served the foregoing Proposed Notice				
5.	of Discipline upon Braxton Nguyen DC, the party hereto, by mailing, certified mall, postage				
6	prepaid, a true, exact and full copy thereof to:				
7					
8					
9	Braxton Nguyen				
10	9055 SW Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy Suite A				
1 [Portland OR 97225				
12					
13	Original Signatures are on file in OBCE office				
14					
15	Day McTarana				
16	Dave Meteronise				
17	Executive Director				
18	Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners				
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
4.€ 					
-,·					