# BEFORE THE BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS STATE OF OREGON

6	In the Matter of		)	
7			)	FINAL STIPULATED
8	Karen Kelsall D.C.	•	)	ORDER
9			)	
10			)	
11	•		)	
12		Licensee.	)	Case # 2006-2000

The Board of Chiropractic Examiners (Board) is the state agency responsible for licensing, regulating and disciplining chiropractic physicians in the State of Oregon. Karen Kelsall, D.C. (Licensee) is licensed by the Board to practice as a chiropractic physician in the State of Oregon. The Board proposes to discipline Licensee pursuant to ORS 684.100(9) for the following reasons.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

The Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners received a complaint as to the chart notes, bills for examination and treatment of Patient 1 submitted by an insurance company. The bills were for "review and payment determination under the workers' compensation fee schedule." The complaint was that documentation did not indicate clinical rationale for treatment for neuromuscular reeducation for soft tissue diagnosis.

2.

Licensee first submitted her bills for treatment of Patient 1 using the CPT code 97112 stating it was for neuromuscular re-education for soft tissue diagnosis. When the insurance company disallowed the CPT code based on lack of clinical rationale for the treatment, Licensee resubmitted the bills, changing the code to code 97140. Again it was disallowed for the same reason by the insurance company. The insurance carrier then wrote to Licensee telling her the document did not support the use of either code. Subsequently, the insurance company received a third set of bills with chart notes. Those chart notes had been altered to support the changed CPT codes.

When confronted with the complaint, Licensee told the Board in a letter dated July 11, 2006, that she "inadvertently pressed the incorrect button" in her computerized soap note system which resulted in the billing for neuromuscular reeducation in code 97112. She stated when the insurer denied payment she reviewed it and a more accurate explanation of the procedure performed was documented and billed as code 97140.

3 4

5

6

7 8 9

20 21

18

19

22 `3 24

25

26 27

28 29 30

33 34

35

36 37

31 32

38 39 40

41

42 43

Three sets of chart notes were received and reviewed by the Peer Review Committee. In an interview with the Committee, Licensee admitted that she altered chart notes after the original set was denied payment. She further admitted that in her response to the board about the "wrong button" she followed bad advice when she responded with that untrue story. Licensee admitted that she altered the chart notes from set 1 to set 2 to alter the codes to assure payment.

5.

Comparison of the three sets of chart notes clearly demonstrates that neuromuscular reeducation was changed to myofascial release on at least 13 entries. In the interview, Licensee admitted that she altered the notes in order to make documentation consistent with the modified CPT codes on the resubmitted bills. Massage and/or myofascial release was either not documented or improperly documented on the same 13 chart entries. The therapists' who worked with Licensee provided statements that this procedure was performed on the dates in question. The original notes of Licensee document neuromuscular reeducation performed to specific muscles. However, massage and/or myofascial release are not typically a part of neuromuscular reeducation. If neuromuscular reeducation had been performed on any of these occasions, the specific NMR activity was not described so the notes cannot be considered to have documented this procedure.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

6.

The Board finds that the above is in violation of ORS 684.100 (1)(g)(A) and OAR 811-015-0005(1), and OAR 811-035-0015(7), (12) and (20). Licensee failed to maintain a complete and accurate record of the care rendered to this patient, her billing and chart note procedures in this case were deceptive and she directly engaged in misleading if not dishonest fee collection techniques and her intent to collect payment for services previously denied by altering the chart notes is dishonest. The chart notes do not meet minimum standards of practice.

## STIPULATIONS

Therefore, pursuant to ORS 183.415(5) and ORS 684.100(9)(e) 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 she is aware of his right to a hearing with her 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 agree to be reprimanded and have a Letter of Reprimand issued by the Board.

I have fully read and fully understand all of the above facts and agree to the above terms: IT IS SO ORDERED effective later date signed below. BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS State of Oregon Original signature on file at the OBCE office. By: Dave McTeague, Executive Director Original signature on file at the OBCE office. By: Karen Kelsall D.C. Date: 4 



# Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners

3218 Pringle Road SE, Suite 150 Salem, OR 97302-6311 (503) 378-5816

FAX: (503) 362-1260 E-mail: oregon.obce@state.or.us www.oregon.gov/OBCE

April 16, 2007

Karen Kelsall, DC Kelsall Chiropractic Clinic 1615 NW 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 2 Portland, Oregon 97210



Re: OBCE Complaint No: 2006-2000, Final Stipulated Order Letter of Reprimand

Dear Dr. Kelsall,

This is your Letter of Reprimand for conduct as identified in the enclosed Final Stipulated Order.

This order is a public document and is a permanent part of your record.

Thank you for your cooperation in resolving this matter.

Si-----

Original signature on file at the OBCE office.

Dave McTeague Executive Director

Cc: Don Jacobs, Attorney at Law

## BEFORE THE **BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS** STATE OF OREGON

5 6 In the Matter of 7 NOTICE OF PROPOSED 8 Karen Kelsall, D.C. LETTER OF REPRIMAND 9 10 11 12 Licensee.

13 14 15

16

17

22

**23** 

24

25

3

The Board of Chiropractic Examiners (Board) is the state agency responsible for licensing, regulating and disciplining chiropractic physicians in the State of Oregon. Karen Kelsall, D.C. (Licensee) is licensed by the Board to practice as a chiropractic physician in the State of Oregon. The Board proposes to discipline Licensee pursuant to ORS 684.100(9) for the following reasons.

Case # 2006-2000

The Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners received a complaint as to the chart notes. bills for examination and treatment of Patient 1 submitted by an insurance company. The bills were for "review and payment determination under the workers' compensation fee schedule." The complaint was that documentation did not indicate clinical rationale for treatment for neuromuscular reeducation for soft tissue diagnosis.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

Licensee first submitted her bills for treatment of Patient 1 using the CPT code 97112 stating it was for neuromuscular re-education for soft tissue diagnosis. When the insurance company disallowed the CPT code based on lack of clinical rationale for the treatment, Licensee resubmitted the bills, changing the code to code 97140. Again it was disallowed for the same reason by the insurance company. The insurance carrier then wrote to Licensee telling her the document did not support the use of either code. Subsequently, the insurance company received a third set of bills with chart notes. Those chart notes had been altered to support the changed CPT codes.

36 37 38

39

40

41

42 43

When confronted with the complaint, Licensee told the Board in a letter dated July 11, 2006, that she "inadvertently pressed the incorrect button" in her computerized soap note system which resulted in the billing for neuromuscular reeducation in code 97112. She stated when the insurer denied payment she reviewed it and a more accurate explanation of the procedure performed was documented and billed as code 97140.

3.

4.

Three sets of chart notes were received and reviewed by the Peer Review Committee. In an interview with the Committee, Licensee admitted that she altered chart notes after the original set was denied payment. She further admitted that in her response to the board about the "wrong button" she followed bad advice when she responded with that untrue story. Licensee admitted that she altered the chart notes from set 1 to set 2 to alter the codes to assure payment.

Comparison of the three sets of chart notes clearly demonstrates that neuromuscular reeducation was changed to myofascial release on at least 12 entries (1/11, 1/12, 1/18, 1/19, 1/25, 2/1, 2/8, 2/16, 2/23, and 2/27 3/7 and 3/13). In the interview, Licensee admitted that she altered the notes in order to make documentation consistent with the modified CPT codes on the resubmitted bills. Massage and/or myofascial release was either not documented or improperly documented on the same 13 chart entries. The therapists' who worked with Licensee provided statements that this procedure was performed on the dates in question. The original notes of Licensee document neuromuscular reeducation performed to specific muscles. However, massage and/or myofascial release are not typically a part of neuromuscular reeducation. If neuromuscular reeducation had been performed on any of these occasions, the specific NMR activity was not described so the notes cannot be considered to have documented this procedure.

The above is in violation of ORS 684.100 (1)(g)(A) and OAR 811-015-0005(1), and OAR 811-035-0015(7), (12) and (20). The conduct above is in violation in that the Licensee failed to maintain a complete and accurate record of the care rendered to this patient, her billing and chart note procedures in this case were deceptive and she directly engaged in misleading if not dishonest fee collection techniques and her intent to collect payment for services previously denied by altering the chart notes is dishonest. The chart notes do not meet minimum standards of practice. In addition, Licensee told a "story" to the Board initially about a computer error causing the issue, and later admitted that she had altered the notes.

Due to the aforementioned violations, the OBCE proposes to issue a Letter of Reprimand.

8.

Licensee has the right, if Licensee requests, to have a formal contested case hearing before the OBCE or its hearings officer to contest the matter set out above. At the hearing, Licensee may be represented by an attorney and subpoena and cross examine witnesses. That request for hearing must be made in writing to the OBCE, must be received by the OBCE within 30 days from the mailing of this notice (or if not mailed, the date of personal service), and must be accompanied by a written answer to the charges contained in this notice.

9.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
13	
]3 24	
23 24 25	
24 25 26	
24 25 26 27	
24 25 26 27 28	
24 25 26 27 28 29	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	

41 42 The answer shall be made in writing to the OBCE and shall include an admission or denial of each factual matter alleged in this notice, and a short plain statement of each relevant affirmative defense Licensee may have. Except for good cause, factual matters alleged in this notice and not denied in the answer will be considered a waiver of such defense; new matters alleged in this answer (affirmative defenses) shall be presumed to be denied by the agency and evidence shall not be taken on any issue not raised in the notice and answer.

10.

If Licensee requests a hearing, before commencement of that hearing, Licensee will be given information on the procedures, rights of representation and other rights of the parties relating to the conduct of the hearing as required under ORS 183.413-415.

11.

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.

12.

Licensee shall pay costs of this disciplinary proceeding, including investigative costs and attorney fees pursuant to ORS 684.100(9)(g).

DATED this Z6 day of March, 2007.

BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS

State of Oreg

Original signature on file at the OBCE office.

By: 1

Dave McTeague, Executive Director

2	State of Oregon	)	Case # 2006-2000		
3	County of Marion	)	Karen Kelsall D.C.		
4					
5					
6	I. Dave McTeague, being firs	st duly sworn	state that I am the Executive Director of	the	
7	Oregon Board of Chiropractic Exam	iners, and as s	such, am authorized to verify pleadings in	inis	
8	case: and that the foregoing Notice of	of Proposed Le	etter of Reprimand is true to the best of m	y	
9	knowledge as I verily believe.				
10	्र इ.स.	Origina	Laisantus		
		origina at tl	I signature on file he OBCE office.		
[] [2		Dave MeTen	Transfer Disaster		
12 13		Dave McTeague, Executive Director Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners			
14		0108011120111	a or omropraodic Examinors		
15					
16 17					
18					
. 4					
19		SUBSCRIBED	AND SWORN to before me		
20		this24	6 day of <i>March</i> , 2007		
21		Origin	nal signature on file		
22		at	the OBCE office.		
23		NOTARY P	UBLIC FOR OREGON		
24			sion Expires:		
25	•				
26			OFFICIAL SEAL JANE A BILLINGS		
27			NOTARY PUBLIC - OREGON		
28			COMMISSION NO. 385081		