1	BEFORE THE
2	BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS
3	STATE OF OREGON
4	
5	In the Matter of
6	) FINAL STIPULATED
7	Daniel Miller, D.C. ) ORDER
8	)
9	
10	Licensee. ) Case # 2009-1006
11	
12	
13 14	
15	The Deard of China was the Company of the Company of China was the China
16	The Board of Chiropractic Examiners (Board) is the state agency responsible for
17	licensing, regulating and disciplining chiropractic physicians in the State of Oregon. Daniel  Miller, D.C. (Licensee), is licensed by the Board to great the state of Oregon.
18	Miller, D.C. (Licensee), is licensed by the Board to practice as a chiropractic physician in the State of Oregon.
19	Findings of Fact I
20	1 mangs of 1 act
21	The Board received a complaint that P -rays showed stress on her heart requiring the need
22	for entropractic care. In response to a complaint, the Oregon Board of Chiropractic Examiners
23	directed the Peer Review Committee (PRC) to review the complaint with Licensee.
24	The state of the s
25	2.
26	Licensee was interviewed by the Peer Review Committee on May 14, 2009 regarding his
27	treatment of Patient 1. Patient 1 signed a contract for a certain amount of visits for a certain sum
28	of money. Patient 1 wanted to stop care because she was getting worse.
29	
30	entre de la companya de la companya La companya de la co
31 32	In the interview Licenses with 11 Court and 1
33	In the interview Licensee provided information and the Peer Review Committee noted the following information:
34	the following information.
35	1 Licensee's chart notes were incomplete and failed to make the second
36	1. Licensee's chart notes were incomplete and failed to meet the minimal standards. The initial chart provided did not include a billing ledger as required, even when Licensee attested he
37	had provided all information. Nor did they contain prior records for the patient. This violates
38	ORS 684.100(1)(g)(A) and OAR 811-015-0005(1) and OAR 811-015-0010(1).
39	2. The patient's subjective complaints did worsen over the course of treatment and over
40	the course of two months, on a treatment frequency average of 2-3 times per week, her subjective
41	a verage of 2-5 times per week, her subjective
42	

43

scores went up from 0 to 7 for headaches, 3 to 4 for neck pain, upper back pain and mid back pain, and stayed the same for low back pain. These numbers and diagrams support the basis of the complaint. There was very little, if any, documentation that showed she responded positively to Licensee's care over the course of almost 5 months and 51 visits. Clinical justification for this amount of care is not supported by the chart note documentation or testimony of Licensee in the interview. This violates ORS 684.100(1)(g)(A), OAR 811-015-0010(1) and OAR 811-030-0030.

3. Licensee recorded less subjective data as the case progressed. There were no more assessment forms or functional rating sheets for the remainder of treatment the last  $2\frac{1}{2}$  months. This violates ORS 684.100(1)(g)(A), and OAR 811-015-0010(1).

4. The chart notes were incomplete and inaccurate. They remained the same throughout treatment. The objective and assessment areas of the charts were cut and pasted from visit to visit. Subjective reports varied very little if at all. There was only one treatment plan found in 51 visits. There was no indication of any change or progress in the examinations. There were no treatment goals, treatment efficacy markers or outcome measures discussed. This violates ORS 684.100(1)(g)(A), OAR 811-015-0010(1)(4) and OAR 811-030-0030.

5. There was no medical history noted in the charts for Patient 1. The records indicate she had been seen previously years ago, but those records nor a history were not present. Without such data, clinical justification for care is not supported especially for 90 planned visits. This violates ORS 684.100(1)(g)(A), and OAR 811-015-0010(4).

6. X-ray reports showed inconsistencies from exam to exam. Three x ray reports showed hypolordosis. One noted Scoliosis and that was not on the others. Degenerative disc disease was noted on one exam but not the other two. The subsequent lumbar x-ray was not focused to the lumbar spine but opened up to the level of T 9. There was no indication why he had such a large exposure area. The remaining two lumbar x rays did not have thoracic exposure. This violates ORS 684.100(1)(g)(B) and OAR 811-035-0005(1).

## **Board Findings**

4.

On July 16, 2009, the Board considered and adopted the report of the Peer Review Committee finding Licensee in violation of ORS 684.100(1)((g)(A) and (B) and OAR 811-010-0110(7), OAR 811-015-0005(1), 811-015-0010(1) and (4), 811-030-0030, 811-035-0005(1) and 811-035-0015, and violating Oregon Chiropractic Practice and Utilization Guidelines for providing care without clinical justification.

- 40 /// 41 ///
- 42 ///
- 43 ///