BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)	
Bayardo Cruz, M.D.	Case No. 06-2009-200309
Physician's and Surgeon's	
Certificate No. A 63740	
Respondent.	

DECISION EFFECTIVE DATE AFTER JUDICIAL STAY

On May 14, 2012, the Medical Board of California issued its Default Decision and Order in the Matter of the Accusation against Bayardo Cruz, M.D. (Respondent) with an effective date of June 13, 2012.

On June 25, 2012, Respondent filed a Petition for Writ of Administrative Mandate and Stay Order in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. BS138042. On June 25, 2012, the Superior Court issued an Order staying the Medical Board's Decision until July 3, 2012, when the matter regarding the issuance of a stay pending petition for administrative mandamus could be heard and decided de novo.

On July 3, 2012, the Superior Court issued an Order denying Respondent's request for stay. Since no additional stays have been granted, the Stay, issued on June 25, 2012, has dissolved and the **Default Decision and Order of the Board became effective July 3, 2012**.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 07/03/12

DEPT. 85

HONORABLE JAMES C. CHALFANT

A. FAJARDO

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

#4

J. DE LUNA, C.A.

NONE Deputy Sheriff

Reporter

8:30 am BS138042

Plaintiff

ANN C. SCHNEIDER

[X]

BAYARDO CRUZ

Counsel

Defendant Counsel

EDWARD K. KIM

[X]

LINDA K WHITNEY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

EX PARTE APPLICATION OF PETITIONER, BAYARDO CRUZ, FOR ORDER TO STAY REVOCATION OF PETITIONER'S PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON LICENSES RETROACTIVE TO JUNE 22, 2012, PENDING DETERMINATION OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

The matter is called for hearing.

The Court has read and considered the above stated Ex Parte Application.

After argument, the Court denies the Application.

The Court and Counsel confer regarding the status of the Record.

A TRIAL SETTING CONFERENCE is set on JULY 24, 2012 at 1:30p.m. in this department.

The Respondent is directed to prepare and consecutively bates stamp the Record.

Notice is waived.

DEPT. 85 Page 1 of 1

MINUTES ENTERED 07/03/12 COUNTY CLERK

BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Agair	sst:)
BAYARDO CRUZ, M.D.) Case No. 06-2009-200309
Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 63740)))
Petitioner.)
)

PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION; DENIAL BY OPERATION OF LAW

No action having been taken on the petition for reconsideration filed by Bayardo Cruz, M.D., (Petitioner), and the time for action having expired at 5 p.m. on June 22, 2012, the petition is deemed denied by operation of law.

However, as Petitioner's *ex parte* application for a stay has been granted by the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, the Medical Board of California's decision in the above-captioned matter has not become effective.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 06/25/12

JUDGE

DEPT. 86

HONORABLE ANN I. JONES

N DIGIAMBATTISTA

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

2E NONE

NONE

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR Reporter

8:30 am BS138042

Deputy Sheriff

Plaintiff

ANN C. SCHNEIDER (X)

BAYARDO CRUZ

VS

LINDA K WHITNEY

Defendant

Counsel

Counsel

NO APPEARANCE

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

EX PARTE APPLICATION OF PETITIONER, BAYARDO CRUZ, FOR ORDER TO STAY REVOCATION OF PETITIONER'S PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON LICENSES RETROACTIVE TO JUNE 22, 2012, PENDING DETERMINATION OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Matter comes on for hearing.

The ex parte application for a stay is granted until July 3, 2012, when the matter regarding the issuance of a stay pending petition for administrative mandamus shall be heard and decided de novo by Judge Chalfant.

The ex parte application is continued to July 3, 2012, at 8:30 a.m. in Department 86.

Petitioner is to give notice of the court's ruling and of the continuance.

> DEPT. 86 1 of 1

MINUTES ENTERED 06/25/12 COUNTY CLERK

BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)	
BAYARDO CRUZ, M.D.)	MBC No. 06-2009-200309
Physician's & Surgeon's)	ORDER GRANTING STAY
Certificate No. A 63740)	(Gov't Code Section 11521)
Respondent)	

Respondent Bayardo Cruz, M.D., has filed a Petition for Reconsideration of the Decision in this matter with an effective date of June 13, 2012.

Execution is stayed until June 22, 2012.

This stay is granted solely for the purpose of allowing the Board to review and consider the Petition for Reconsideration.

DATED: June 7, 2012

A. Renee Threadgill Chief of Enforcement

Medical Board of California

1	Kamala D. Harris		
2	Attorney General of California GLORIA L. CASTRO		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General BENETH A. BROWNE		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 202679		
5	300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013		
6	Telephone: (213) 897-7816 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395		
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA		
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10		G N 06 2000 200200	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against	Case No. 06-2009-200309	
12	BAYARDO CRUZ, M.D. P.O. Box 6570	DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER	
13	Buena Park, CA 90622	[Gov. Code, §11520.]	
14	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 63740		
15	Respondent.		
16	Respondent.		
17			
18	FINDING	S OF FACT	
19	1. On or about April 14, 2011, Compla	inant Linda K. Whitney, in her official capacity	
20	as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs,		
21	filed Accusation No. 06-2009-200309 against Bayardo Cruz, M.D. (Respondent) before the		
22	Medical Board of California.		
23	2. On or about October 24, 1997, the Medical Board of California (Board) issued		
24	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 63740 to Respondent. The Physician's and		
25	Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought		
26	herein and will expire on October 31, 2013, unless renewed. A true and correct copy of the		
27	Certificate of Licensure setting forth Respondent's address of record and licensing history is		
28	attached hereto as Exhibit A and is incorporated herein by reference.		

- 3. On or about April 14, 2011, Kelly Montalbano, an employee of the Complainant Agency, served by Certified Mail a copy of Accusation No. 06-2009-200309, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and copies of Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is P.O. Box 6570, Buena Park, California 90622. A true and correct copy of the Accusation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as **Exhibit B**, and are incorporated herein by reference.
- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
- 5. On or about May 4, 2011, the Board received a U.S. Postal Service return receipt indicating that Respondent received the documents on or about May 2, 2011. A true and correct copy of the return receipt is attached as **Exhibit C**, and is incorporated herein by reference.
 - 6. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
- "(c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing."
- 7. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 06-2009-200309. Although he received actual service nearly a year ago, Respondent has failed to file a notice of defense or give any notice to Complainant of his intent to contest the accusation.
 - 8. Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent."
- 9. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. Based on Respondent's express admissions by way of default and the

evidence before it contained in Exhibits A through E, the Board finds that the allegations in Accusation No. 06-2009-200309 are true. The Board will take action without further hearing.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Bayardo Cruz, M.D. has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 63740 to discipline.
- 2. True and correct copies of Respondent's licensing history, Accusation and related documents and declaration of service, U.S. Postal return receipt and Declaration of Deputy Attorney General Beneth A. Browne (**Exhibit D**) are attached as Exhibits A through D, respectively.
 - 3. The Board has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 4. The Medical Board of California is authorized to revoke Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation:
 - a. Business and Professions Code section 2234, subdivision (e), dishonest or corrupt acts that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions and /or duties of a physician. Paragraphs 18 through 24 of the Accusation, **Exhibit B**, are incorporated here by Reference.
 - b. Business and Professions Code section 2261, presentation of false documents directly or indirectly related to his practice of medicine which falsely represented the existence or nonexistence of a state of facts. Paragraphs 18 through 24 and 27 of the Accusation, **Exhibit B**, are incorporated here by reference.
 - c. Business and Professions Code section 2238, violation of state statute
 regulating dangerous drugs. Paragraphs 18 through 24 and 31 of the Accusation, Exhibit
 B, are incorporated here by reference.
 - d. Business and Professions Code section 2238, violation of federal statute regulating dangerous drugs. Paragraphs 18 through 24, 35 and 36 of the Accusation, **Exhibit B**, are incorporated here by reference.

ORDER IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physicians and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 63740 issued to Respondent Bayardo Cruz, M.D., is revoked. Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of this Decision and Order on Respondent. The Board in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute. This Decision shall become effective on _____ June 13, 2012 It is so ORDERED May 14, 2012 DEPARTMENT OF COMSUMER AFFAIRS Linda K. Whitney, Executive Director LA2010503907 60760806.doc

FLED STATE OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 1 KAMALA D. HARRIS SACRAMENTO APEIL 14 2011 Attorney General of California MONTALRANU ANALYST 2 ROBERT MCKIM BELL Supervising Deputy Attorney General 3 BENETH A. BROWNE Deputy Attorney General 4 State Bar No. 202679 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702 5 Los Angeles, California 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-7816 6 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395 Attorneys for Complainant 7 8 **BEFORE THE** MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 9 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 Case No. 06-2009-200309 In the Matter of the Accusation Against: 12 BAYARDO CRUZ, M.D. 13 ACCUSATION Post Office Box 6570 Buena Park, California 90622 14 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate A 63740, 15 Respondent. 16 17 18 Complainant alleges: 19 **PARTIES** 20 1. Linda K. Whitney (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity 21 as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California ("Board"). 22 2. On or about October 24, 1997, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate number A 63740 to Bayardo Cruz, M.D. (Respondent). That license was in full force and effect 23 24 at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on October 31, 2011, unless 25 renewed. **JURISDICTION** 26 27 This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following 3. laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated. 28 1

4. Section 2004 of the Code states:

"The board shall have the responsibility for the following:

- "(a) The enforcement of the disciplinary and criminal provisions of the Medical Practice

 Act.
 - "(b) The administration and hearing of disciplinary actions.
- "(c) Carrying out disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by a panel or an administrative law judge.
- "(d) Suspending, revoking, or otherwise limiting certificates after the conclusion of disciplinary actions.
- "(e) Reviewing the quality of medical practice carried out by physician and surgeon certificate holders under the jurisdiction of the board.
 - "(f) Approving undergraduate and graduate medical education programs.
- "(g) Approving clinical clerkship and special programs and hospitals for the programs in subdivision (f).
 - "(h) Issuing licenses and certificates under the board's jurisdiction.
 - "(i) Administering the board's continuing medical education program."
- 5. Section 2227 of the Code provides that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his or her license revoked, suspended for a period not to exceed one year, placed on probation and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or such other action taken in relation to discipline as the Division¹ deems proper.
 - 6. Section 2228 of the Code states:

"The authority of the board or a division of the board or the California Board of Podiatric Medicine to discipline a licensee by placing him or her on probation includes, but is not limited to, the following:

¹ California Business and Professions Code section 2002, as amended and effective January 1, 2008, provides that, unless otherwise expressly provided, the term "board" as used in the State Medical Practice Act (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code, §§2000, et seq.) means the "Medical Board of California," and references to the "Division of Medical Quality" and "Division of Licensing" in the Act or any other provision of law shall be deemed to refer to the Board.

- "(a) Requiring the licensee to obtain additional professional training and to pass an examination upon the completion of the training. The examination may be written or oral, or both, and may be a practical or clinical examination, or both, at the option of the board or division or the administrative law judge.
- "(b) Requiring the licensee to submit to a complete diagnostic examination by one or more physicians and surgeons appointed by the division. If an examination is ordered, the board or division shall receive and consider any other report of a complete diagnostic examination given by one or more physicians and surgeons of the licensee's choice.
- "(c) Restricting or limiting the extent, scope, or type of practice of the licensee, including requiring notice to applicable patients that the licensee is unable to perform the indicated treatment, where appropriate.
- "(d) Providing the option of alternative community service in cases other than violations relating to quality of care, as defined by the Division of Medical Quality."
 - 7. Section 2032 of the Code states:

"'Person' means any individual, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or other organization, or any combination thereof, except that only natural persons shall be licensed under this chapter [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act]."

8. Section 2410 of the Code states:

"A medical or podiatry corporation shall not do or fail to do any act the doing of which or the failure to do which would constitute unprofessional conduct under any statute or regulation now or hereafter in effect. In the conduct of its practice, it shall observe and be bound by such statutes and regulations to the same extent as a licensee under this chapter [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act]."

- 9. Welfare and Institutions Code section 14107 states:
- "(a) Any person, including any applicant or provider as defined in Section 14043.1, or billing agent, as defined in Section 14040.1, who engages in any of the activities identified in subdivision (b) is punishable by imprisonment as set forth in subdivisions (c), (d), and (e), by a fine not exceeding three times the amount of the fraud or improper reimbursement or value of the

- "(c) The receipt in interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, tobacco product, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded, and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise.
 - 14. Health and Safety Code section 111430 states:

"A drug or device is misbranded if it was manufactured in an establishment not duly registered with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States."

15. Health and Safety Code section 111440 states:

"It is unlawful for any person to manufacture, sell, deliver, hold, or offer for sale any drug or device that is misbranded."

16. Health and Safety Code section 111450 states:

"It is unlawful for any person to receive in commerce any drug or device that is misbranded or to deliver or proffer for delivery any drug or device."

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Dishonest or Corrupt Acts)

- 17. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code section 2234, subdivision (e), in that he committed acts involving dishonesty or corruption that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and/or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- 18. At all times material hereto only the Mirena intrauterine device (IUD) and the ParaGard T380A copper IUD were approved for use in the United States by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). At all times material hereto the State of California, through its Medi-Cal program, reimbursed physicians for the insertion only of FDA-approved IUDs.
- 19. On January 24, 2007 respondent told investigators of the FDA that prior to 2004 he used ParaGard T380A IUDs and purchased them directly from the manufacturer. In 2004, respondent stopped using the ParaGard IUD, in part due to the product cost (approximately \$300 to \$400 dollars per IUD) and limited reimbursement amount by Medi-Cal (approximately \$250 per IUD). Respondent further explained that, because the Medi-Cal program did not reimburse the entire amount of the ParaGard IUD purchase price, his business would lose money for every

ParaGard IUD purchased.

- 20. In 2004, Universal Services, a local medical supply company approached Respondent at his place of business and offered a Mexican manufactured IUD for approximately \$30 per IUD. Universal Services claimed the Mexican IUD was the same product as a ParaGard, just under a different brand name. Respondent examined the IUD, and concluded that it appeared similar to the ParaGard.
- 21. Respondent also told the FDA investigators that he did not suspect anything wrong with buying and using the Mexican IUDs, because he purchased them from a medical supply company. After respondent began purchasing and using the Mexican IUDs, his office continued to bill Medi-Cal using the "x1522" code (reserved by Medi-Cal for insertion of ParaGard IUDs) and received the same reimbursement amount as he had received for the ParaGard. Respondent told a Medical Board investigator that he compared the patients' charts with the bills before submitting them to a billing company for processing. Respondent inserted approximately 110 Mexican IUDs in 2005 and 2006 in this way and Medi-Cal paid Respondent a total of \$38,321.12 based on his false claims that he inserted FDA-approved ParaGard intrauterine devices into those patients.
- 22. Respondent worked as a solo practitioner and did business as B.A. Cruz, M.D., a Medical Corporation. No person other than respondent held any legal interest in that corporation.
- 23. On or about May 7, 2009, in the action titled *People of the State of California v*.

 Bayardo A. Cruz; B. A. Cruz M.D., a Medical Corporation and Ana Patricia Rodas, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 07F1277, respondent pleaded guilty on behalf of B. A. Cruz, M.D., a Medical Corporation to Count II of the Felony Complaint in that action. That count alleged in part: "... defendants... did knowingly prepare, make, subscribe or aid, abet, solicit or conspire with others to prepare, make or subscribe a writing in support of fraudulent claims, to wit, defendants submitted fraudulent claims to the Medi-Cal program in ... stating that patients were receiving ParaGard intrauterine devices when, in fact, they were not" The sentence following this plea of guilty required repayment of \$38,000 in victim restitution, three years of formal probation and 150 hours of community service by respondent within nine months.

24. Submitting false claims to Medi-Cal for over \$38,000 and inserting non-FDA-approved intrauterine devices, the safety of which was unknown, into his patients for his own financial gain was dishonest and/or corrupt.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Presentation of False Documents)

- 25. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code section 2261 in that he knowingly made or signed a certificate or documents directly or indirectly related to his practice of medicine which falsely represented the existence or nonexistence of a state of facts. The circumstances are as follows:
- 26. The allegations of the First Cause for Discipline are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.
- 27. The Medi-Cal claims that respondent submitted falsely represented that he had inserted FDA-approved ParaGard intrauterine devices into his patients.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Violation of State Statute Regulating Dangerous Drugs)

- 28. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2238 in that he violated state statutes regulating dangerous drugs. The circumstances are as follows:
- 29. Respondent violated Health and Safety Code sections 111440 and 111450. The circumstances are as follows:
- 30. The allegations of the First Cause for Discipline are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.
- 31. The intrauterine devices were misbranded. They were not manufactured in an establishment duly registered with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Violation of Federal Statute Regulating Dangerous Drugs)

32. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2238 in that he violated federal statutes regulating dangerous drugs. The circumstances are as follows: