

**NEW MEXICO MEDICAL BOARD**  
**Special Call Meeting**  
**491 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, New Mexico**  
**July 13 - 21, 2004**

**MINUTES**

Members Present:

John S. Romine, M.D., Chairman, Physician Member  
Paul J. Kovnat, M.D., Co Chair, Physician Member  
C. Grant La Farge, M.D., Secretary-Treasurer  
Steve Weiner, M.D., Physician Member  
Prakash Ranka, M.D., Physician Member  
Vivian Giudice, M.D., Physician Member  
Maureen Boshier, Public Member  
Reza Ghadimi, P.A., Public Member  
Richard Heim, Public Member

Also Present:

Charlotte Kinney, Executive Director  
Corliss Thalley, AGA  
Jenny Felmley, PIO

The Special Meeting of the New Mexico Medical Board convened at 8:05 a.m., Tuesday, July 13, 2004, in the Board Conference room, Lamy Building, 491 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, New Mexico, ***Grant La Farge, M.D.*** presiding. Dr. La Farge called the roll and a quorum was declared with members La Farge, Giudice (teleconference), Weiner (teleconference), Romine (teleconference), Boshier (teleconference), Ghademi (teleconference), and Ranka (teleconference) present.

**1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA.**

Ms. Boshier **MOVED** the agenda be approved as presented. Dr. La Farge **SECONDED** the motion, which **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

**2. LICENSURE MATTERS**

**A. CASE #2003-020 Ravi Bhasker, M.D.**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION: MOTION** was made by Dr. La Farge and seconded by Ms. Boshier to go into executive session to discuss matters of licensure. **YES:** La Farge, Ghadimi, Giudice, Boshier, Romine, Weiner, and Ranka. **MOTION CARRIED.** The Board returned to open session. Dr. La Farge stated for the record that the matters discussed in closed session were limited to only those specified in the motion for closure.

Ms. Boshier **MOVED** to accept the following paragraphs from the Hearing Officers Report: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34. Dr. La Farge **SECONDED** the motion. **YES:** La Farge, Romine, Weiner, Giudice, Boshier, Ranka and Ghadimi. **MOTION CARRIED.** Dr. La Farge **MOVED** the following paragraphs be modified and renumbered: 9, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25 and 27.

The conference call was terminated unexpectedly at 10:00 a.m. and the meeting ended before the motion received a second. A continuation of the meeting was scheduled for Thursday, July 15<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 p.m.

## **RECONVENED, JULY 15, 2004**

The Reconvened Special Meeting of the New Mexico Medical Board was called to Order at 1:20 p.m., Thursday, July 15, 2004, in the Conference room, NM Hospital Association, 2121 Osuna Rd NE, Albuquerque, New Mexico, **John Romine, M.D.** presiding. Dr. Romine called the roll and a quorum was declared with members Romine (teleconference), Boshier, Giudice (teleconference), Ranka (teleconference), and La Farge (teleconference) present. Mr. Ghadimi and Dr. Weiner (teleconference) joined the meeting at 1:30 p.m. Dr. Kovnat (teleconference) joined the meeting at 1:35 p.m. Mr. Heim did not join the reconvened meeting.

Dr. Romine reminded everyone that paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 34 from the Hearing Officer's report were adopted unanimously on July 13<sup>th</sup>. Dr. La Farge was interrupted in the middle of a motion to accept additional and revised findings. Dr. Romine further stated that the agenda was approved on July 13, 2004, but the deliberation and decision in Case #2004-006 is being rescheduled.

### **2A. LICENSURE MATTERS, #2003-020, Ravi Bhasker, MD, cont.**

Dr. La Farge **MOVED** to adopt modified and new Findings of Fact as follows:

9. The recommendation of Ms. Salmeron was that Respondent not be referred to treatment because "the consequences already imposed by the court system seem to be sufficient enough to prevent further DWI offences, however if he should re-offend a LEVEL 1 alcohol outpatient treatment should be considered." Ex. 9, p. 2.

12. As part of the investigation, an Impaired Physician Committee (IPC) was convened. The IPC did not take a verbatim record or transcript of the questions asked and Respondent's answers. Some IPC questions and Respondent answers are not in the report, Tr. 45-46, 50-52, although it was stated in the IPC report that the Respondent acknowledged to the IPC that "his judgment is impaired when he drinks but then added that he can control his drinking and is not drinking at work." Ex. 6, p.3. The IPC interviewed the Respondent and did not have information from collateral sources.

15. Dr. Parsons is a licensed physician and served on the New Mexico Board of Medical Examiners from 1991 to 2001. Tr. 20.

18. It is the opinion of the IPC that the Respondent is both a user of alcohol habitually to excess as well as suffering from alcohol abuse. Ex. 6, p. 4.

20. The IPC concluded that Respondent met the DSM-IV TR criteria A (2) and A (4) for Substance Abuse, Alcohol, and criterion B for Substance Dependence, Alcohol. The IPC report states that Respondent agreed that he met criteria for Substance Abuse. The majority of the IPC concluded that Respondent "can practice medicine with reasonable care and safety if, and only if it is stipulated that he is followed by and under the supervision of the Physician's Monitored Treatment Program (MTP)." The minority concluded that "the physician [Respondent] be evaluated by the MTP to see if monitoring or treatment is needed and that this be his voluntary act without license stipulation, unless the physician [Respondent] does not go for the evaluation." Ex. 6.p. 4. As of the date of the hearing, Respondent had not voluntarily gone to MTP for evaluation.

21. Respondent stated that he did not understand the purpose of the IPC, Tr. 85, and that he was not prepared for the type of questioning he received. Respondent also stated that he was stunned as to the manner of the questioning by Dr. Feerman. Tr. 302-303.

25. Respondent's wife's testimony is in contrast to the Respondent's affirmative answer to the IPC's question, "Does your spouse give you a hard time about your drinking?" Ex. 6 p. 2. Respondent also told Dr. Foote that if he has as many as "3 or 4 drinks in her presence, she becomes annoyed." Ex. D. p. 5.

27. On March 27, 2003, Respondent traveled to Santa Fe, New Mexico on his way to a seminar held in Las Vegas, New Mexico. Respondent stated that he had consumed 5 or 6 beers in Santa Fe before departing in his vehicle for Las Vegas, New Mexico. Respondent expressed great remorse and embarrassment for his decision to drive that evening. Following his arrest, Respondent pled no contest to DWI and was given a sentence of 90 days probation and was mandated to a DWI assessment. Respondent took other steps to acknowledge his mistake, including direct, immediate notification of the arrest to his wife and family, and cooperation with the DWI assessment. Tr.266.

29. Respondent has admitted his past drinking practices, consisting of intermittent consumption of

5 to 6 beers at a sitting. Ex.6 p.3. There have also been discrepancies in Respondent's statements regarding the number of drinks he has had on occasions. Respondent denied ever drinking anything stronger than beer. Respondent denied that he told the IPC that his average number of beers per week is 12-18, Tr. 311.

30. Respondent's hearing testimony is in contrast to the IPC report in which Respondent was asked, "Prior to the DUI arrest what is the average total number of drinks per week that you were drinking?" The Respondent told us it was 12 to 18...Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday." Ex.6 p.2.

31. The IPC report emphasizes Respondents' self-report of the number of times the Respondent was intoxicated (3 to 4 in the year prior to the DWI) before the event of March 2003. In response to the IPC question as to how many times the Respondent had driven while intoxicated in the year prior to the DWI, the Respondent had answered "3 or 4." Ex.6 p.3. There are contradictory statements on whether the question from the IPC committee was the number of times the Respondent may have been intoxicated in the last year or over the entire history of drinking. Dr. Leckman testified in his opinion that the Respondent had only sporadic episodes of over-using alcohol and that the Respondent had stated that he is very ready to give up alcohol. Ex. B, p. 34.

33. William Eugene Foote, Ph. D., is a clinical and forensic psychologist who has practiced psychology for 25 years and was hired by the Respondent. Ex. C; Tr. 188. Dr. Foote evaluated Respondent (Ex. D) and testified at the hearing. Dr. Foote conducted three psychological tests and conducted collateral interviews. Tr. 205; Ex. D, p. 6-7. Dr. Foote found that Respondent had had a problem with alcohol. Ex. D, p. 9. Dr. Foote found, however, that there was no evidence that Respondent had been habitually drunk, or violent while drinking. Ex. D., p. 9. Dr. Foote also found that, generally, the "[Respondent] does not appear to be experiencing any major dysfunction in his life or any problems which would suggest that he is not meeting occupational and social expectations." Ex. D, p. 8. Dr. Foote also stated that, "all the evidence we have on impairment in his (Respondent's) case is of a single instance of driving while intoxicated." Ex. D p. 9. Dr. Foote found that "[t]here is no evidence at all that he [Respondent] has allowed alcohol to impair his work as a physician." Dr. Foote further stated, "It is my opinion that Dr. Bhasker has an alcohol problem that is more severe than he admits. It is my opinion that he can benefit from treatment of the problem." Ex. D. p. 9-10. Other evidence, including Respondent's self-reported previous instances of driving while intoxicated (3 to 4 times in the year prior to the DWI arrest), supports a finding that Respondent failed to meet societal and social expectations. Dr. Foote went on to conclude that a mandatory treatment program is not necessary in this case, Ex. D., p. 9 and recommends a voluntary evaluation without license stipulation. Ex. D., p. 10. Dr. Foote also stated that he felt that Respondent was motivated enough to get this problem behind him without mandated treatment. Tr. 210, 230.

38. Because of the Respondent's numerous conflicting statements between the IPC interview and the Hearing, and given Dr. Foote's report that Respondent understated his drinking habits, Ex. D. p. 9-10, there is considerable question about the credibility of the responses concerning his drinking. Respondent's unguarded and candid statements to the IPC, made at a time when Respondent had no motive to deceive or rationalize his conduct, are more reliable than Respondent's later statements.

39. Respondent's remorse, as expressed at the Hearing, appeared to be genuine and Respondent stated that he believes that he has taken appropriate action on his own to deal with his past use of alcohol by ceasing to consume it. He also stated that he believes that he has never consumed alcohol habitually or to excess and that his drinking has never affected his judgment. Respondent's statement is in contrast to evidence presented above in which he had acknowledged impairment when drinking (§12), that he had been cited for DWI (§25), that he had consumed 12 to 18 drinks a week (§26), and that he had been intoxicated while driving on past occasions (§27, 29).

40. Respondent stated that he does not feel that monitored treatment is necessary for him to be able to practice without alcohol consumption in the future. He also stated that formal stipulation is not necessary under these circumstances. Tr. 316-19.

41. The evidence supports the finding that the Respondent has used alcohol to excess.

Dr. Giudice **SECONDED** the motion, **YES:** Romine, Boshier, Giudice, Ghadimi, La Farge, Weiner, and Ranka. **RECUSED:** Kovnat. **MOTION CARRIED.**

Dr. Giudice **MOVED** to accept the following Conclusions of Law:

1. The Board has jurisdiction over Respondent and the subject matter.

2. The Board has complied with all notice and hearing requirements of the Uniform Licensing Act and has afforded Respondent all due process rights required by law. The Decision is timely rendered.

3. Pursuant to NMSA 1978, § 61-6-15 (A), the Board has authority to discipline a licensee upon satisfactory proof that the holder of the license has been guilty of unprofessional or dishonorable conduct. Pursuant to NMSA 1978, §61-6-15(B), for good cause shown, the Board has authority to place a licensee on probation for the protection of the public.

4. Pursuant to NMSA 1978, § 61-6-15 (D)(7), unprofessional or dishonorable conduct is defined to include habitual or excessive use of intoxicants or drugs.

5. The Administrative Prosecutor proved by a preponderance of the evidence in the record that Respondent violated § 61-6-15 (D)(7) as alleged in the NCA, in that Respondent has used alcohol to excess.

6. The Board has satisfactory proof to discipline Respondent for unprofessional or dishonorable conduct and has good cause to place Respondent on probation.

Dr. La Farge **SECONDED** the motion, **YES:** Romine, Boshier, Giudice, Ghadimi, La Farge, Weiner, and Ranka. **RECUSED:** Kovnat. **MOTION CARRIED.**

Dr. Giudice **MOVED** to Order Dr. Bhasker to be placed on probation with the following terms and conditions:

1. Respondent shall perform the duties of a physician under the supervision of the New Mexico Monitored Treatment Program (MTP).

2. Respondent shall abstain completely from the use of alcohol and controlled substances, except as prescribed by a licensed physician for a legitimate medical purpose.

3. Respondent shall contract with MTP and shall comply with MTP terms, including submitting to random fluid testing at the request of the MTP or the Board or the Board's designee.

4. Respondent shall appear before the Board on a quarterly basis or upon the Board's request.

5. Respondent shall submit quarterly written reports to the Board attesting to his compliance with the terms of this ORDER.

6. Respondent shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws.

7. Respondent shall execute a waiver of confidentiality allowing the MTP to release to the Board test results, information, and data gathered by the MTP relating to Respondent's participation in or compliance with the MTP program. The Board shall maintain the confidentiality of such information received from MTP, except to the extent necessary to carry out the Board's purposes, including enforcement of the provisions of this ORDER

8. In the event Respondent breaches any of the provisions of this ORDER, the Board may immediately and summarily suspend Respondent's license to practice medicine in New Mexico. In the event of summary suspension, Respondent shall be entitled to notice and formal hearing within ten (10) days of the effective date of suspension. In the alternative, the Board may initiate an action to enforce the provisions of this ORDER in accordance with procedures set forth in the Uniform Licensing Act, NMSA 1978, §§ 61-1-1 through 61-1-33.

Dr. La Farge **SECONDED** the motion, **YES:** Romine, Boshier, Giudice, La Farge, and Weiner. **NO:** Ranka and Ghadimi. **RECUSED:** Kovnat. **MOTION CARRIED.** For the record, Dr. Ranka stated that it is his belief that Dr. Bhasker has already been punished enough.

## 2. LICENSURE MATTERS, cont.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:** **MOTION** was made by Dr. La Farge and seconded by Ms. Boshier to go into executive session to discuss matters of licensure. **YES:** La Farge, Ghadimi, Kovnat, Giudice, Boshier, Romine, Weiner, and Ranka. **MOTION CARRIED.** Dr. La Farge and Dr. Ranka left the meeting as they are recused in this matter.

The Board returned to open session. Dr. La Farge stated for the record that the matters discussed in closed session were limited to only those specified in the motion for closure.

**B. CASE #2003-E-079, Majid Syed, MD**

Dr. Kovnat **MOVED** that the NCA in Case #2004-E-079 be withdrawn. Dr. Ranka **SECONDED** the motion, **YES:** La Farge, Kovnat, Giudice, Boshier, Weiner, Ghadimi, and Ranka. **RECUSED:** Romine. **ABSENT:** Heim. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**C. Case #2004-015, Marc Beverly, PA**

Dr. Kovnat **MOVED** to accept the voluntary surrender of Mr. Beverly and dismiss the pending NCA in Case #2004-015. Dr. Weiner **SECONDED** the motion, **YES:** Romine, Kovnat, Giudice, Boshier, Weiner, and Ranka. **RECUSED:** Ghadimi and La Farge. **ABSENT:** Heim. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**D. Complaint Committee Report on #2004-D-109**

Dr. Romine **MOVED** to refer the applicant in complaint #2004-D-109 to an Impaired Physicians Committee for evaluation. Dr. Kovnat **SECONDED** the motion, **YES:** Romine, Kovnat, Giudice, Boshier, Weiner, Ghadimi, and Ranka. **RECUSED:** La Farge. **ABSENT:** Heim. **MOTION CARRIED.**

Meeting recessed at 2:45 p.m.

**RECONVENED, JULY 21, 2004**

The Special Meeting of the New Mexico Medical Board reconvened at 5:12 p.m., Wednesday, July 21, 2004, in the Board Conference room, Lamy Building, 491 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, New Mexico, *Paul J. Kovnat, M.D.* presiding. Dr. Kovnat called the roll and a quorum was declared with members Heim (teleconference), Kovnat, La Farge, Ghademi (teleconference), and Ranka (teleconference) present. Dr. Weiner (teleconference), Dr. Romine (teleconference) and Ms. Boshier (teleconference) joined the meeting and did not participate in any discussion related to Case #2004-012. Dr. Giudice did not join the reconvened meeting.

**4. CASE #2004-012 Jonathan Burg, M.D.**

Dr. Kovnat **MOVED** to accept the proposed Order, clarifying the Order of Suspension. Dr. Burg is not prohibited from referring his patients to other health care practitioners for the purpose of providing continuity of care for the patients. Dr. La Farge **SECONDED** the motion, **YES:** Heim, Ghadimi, La Farge, Kovnat, and Ranka. **RECUSED:** Weiner, Boshier, Romine. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**2,E. LICENSURE MATTERS, #2004-006, Rakesh Patel, MD**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:** **MOTION** was made by Dr. Kovnat and seconded by Dr. Romine to go into executive session to discuss matters of licensure. **YES:** La Farge, Ghadimi, Kovnat, Heim, Boshier, Romine, Weiner, and Ranka. **MOTION CARRIED.** Dr. La Farge and Dr. Ranka left the meeting as they are recused in this matter.

The Board returned to open session. Dr. Kovnat stated for the record that the matters discussed in closed session were limited to only those specified in the motion for closure.

In Case #2004-006 (**Rakesh D. Patel, MD**), Dr. Kovnat **MOVED** to accept the following Findings of Fact as presented by Dr. Weiner.

1. At all times material to this action Respondent was and is licensed to practice medicine by the Board. Tr. 28-29; Ex. 6.
2. Respondent is or has been engaged in the *Locum Tenens* practice of medicine in ten states, including New Mexico, Arizona, North Carolina, and Louisiana. Tr. 20.

3. Respondent has not practiced medicine in New Mexico for 5 years. Tr. 34.
4. On April 5, 2004 the Board initiated an action against Respondent by issuing a Notice of Contemplated Action ("NCA"). Ex. 1.
5. The NCA alleges that the Arizona Medical Board disciplined Respondent on October 3, 2002 for sexual intimacies with patients, which would constitute a violation of NMSA 1978, Section 61-6-15 (D)(14), discipline imposed on a licensee by another state based upon acts by the licensee similar to acts that would be grounds for discipline in New Mexico. Ex. 1, ¶¶ 2(A) and 3.
6. The NCA further alleges that Respondent entered into a Consent Agreement and Order with the State of Pennsylvania on May 4, 2003. Thereafter, Respondent on May 24, 2003 signed a New Mexico Medical Board Renewal Application and failed to disclose that the Pennsylvania State Board of Medicine had taken or started action relating to his license. The above allegations would constitute a violation of NMSA 1978, Section 61-6-15 (D)(8), fraud or misrepresentation in connection with applying for or procuring [license] renewal. Ex. 1, ¶¶ 2(B), 2(C), and 5.
7. The NCA further alleges that the discipline imposed by the Pennsylvania State Board of Medicine as a result of the action of the Arizona Medical Board Order constitutes a violation of NMSA 1978, Section 61-6-15 (D)(14), discipline imposed on a licensee by another state based upon acts by the licensee similar to acts that would be grounds for discipline in New Mexico. Ex. 1, ¶¶ 2(B) and 4.
8. Respondent was served a copy of the NCA and requested a hearing. Ex. 2. Respondent was served a notice of the date, time, and place for hearing. The NCA and the notice of hearing included a statement of Respondent's rights under NMSA 1978, 61-1-8. Exs. 1, 3.
9. The Administrative Prosecutor presented a certified copy of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order of the Arizona Medical Board. Ex. 4. The Arizona Medical Board issued findings of fact that included, *inter alia*, findings of sexual misconduct toward two female patients during physical examinations. The Arizona Medical Board concluded that Respondent's conduct toward the patients constituted unprofessional conduct in violation of the Arizona law, "[s]exual intimacies with a patient." Ex. 4.
10. Respondent's sexual misconduct toward two patients occurred during preoperative physical examinations. Based on our knowledge and experience as physicians and as a physician assistant, preoperative patients experience high levels of anxiety and are extremely vulnerable.
11. Respondent continues to deny the specific findings of the Arizona Medical Board (sexual intimacies with a patient) that led to the discipline imposed by the Arizona Medical Board. Ex. 6, Attachment; Tr. 14.
12. Sexual intimacies with patients are grounds for discipline of a licensee in New Mexico. *See* NMAC 16.10.8.8 (B).
13. On May 4, 2003 Respondent and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania entered into a settlement agreement in which Respondent consented to entry of an Order placing Respondent's license to practice medicine on an indefinite period of probation based on the Arizona Medical Board's disciplinary action. Ex. 5.
14. On May 24, 2003, Respondent completed and filed a Renewal Application for the state of New Mexico Medical Board in which he was asked: "Has any action, including a disciplinary action, limitation, restriction, order for a competency examination, or any agreement, for any reason including rehabilitation, been taken or started by any state licensing board?" Respondent attached an explanation of the action taken by the Arizona Medical Board on October 3, 2002. Ex. 6.
15. Respondent admitted he failed to include any statement or explanation of the action taken or started by the Pennsylvania State Board of Medicine. Ex. 6; Tr. 13.
16. Respondent testified that his failure to report the Pennsylvania action on his Renewal Application was a simple oversight, based on his focus on the Arizona action. Respondent testified that he was not intending to hide anything from the New Mexico Medical Board. Tr. 13.
17. Respondent testified that the state of Arizona informed him that Arizona would report the disciplinary action to the national database, which would be the mechanism that other states would learn of the discipline, and that he was waiting until the time of renewal to report to the different states in which he is licensed. Tr. 26.
18. Respondent testified that he has changed his office practice since the Arizona Order so that he continues to use a chaperone for pelvic examination, that he now uses a chaperone for all examinations of private organs including breasts, that he has ceased to demonstrate massage techniques on any patient, and that he has completed the Arizona mandated 20-hour ethics course. Tr. 29-33,

19. Completion of mandated 20-hour ethics course is insufficient to protect the public, particularly in light of Respondent's continued denial of misconduct toward female patients when the patients are likely to be most vulnerable.

Mr. Heim **SECONDED** the motion. **YES:** Kovnat, Heim, Romine, Boshier, and Weiner. **MOTION CARRIED.** Mr. Ghadimi was disconnected and rejoined the meeting after this vote.

Dr. Kovnat **MOVED** to accept the following Conclusions of Law as presented by Dr. Weiner.

1. The Board has jurisdiction over the Respondent and the subject matter.  
2. The Board has complied with all notice and hearing requirements of the Uniform Licensing Act and has afforded Respondent all due process rights required by law. The Decision and Order is timely rendered.

3. Pursuant to Section 61-6-15 (D)(14), the Board has authority to discipline a licensee based upon discipline imposed on a licensee by another state, based upon acts by the licensee similar to acts that would constitute ground for discipline in New Mexico.

4. The Administrative Prosecutor proved by a preponderance of the evidence in the record that Respondent violated Section 61-6-15 (D)(14), in that Respondent had discipline imposed by the Arizona Medical Board based upon acts by Respondent in Arizona that are similar to acts that would be grounds for discipline in New Mexico, sexual intimacies with patients. New Mexico Rule NMAC 16.10.8.8 (B) defines unprofessional or dishonorable conduct to include sexual misconduct that occurs concurrently with the physician-patient relationship.

5. The Administrative Prosecutor proved by clear and convincing evidence in the record that Respondent violated Section 61-6-15 (D)(8), unprofessional or dishonorable conduct that includes fraud or misrepresentation in connection with applying for or procuring license renewal.

6. The Administrative Prosecutor failed to prove that Respondent committed acts in Pennsylvania that would be ground for discipline in New Mexico because the discipline taken by the Pennsylvania State Medical Board was based solely on Respondent's conduct in Arizona.

7. Pursuant to Section 61-6-15 (D), the Board has authority to revoke or suspend a license or fine, censure or reprimand a licensee upon satisfactory proof that the licensee is guilty of unprofessional or dishonorable conduct.

8. The Board has sufficient evidence in the record to suspend Respondent's license to practice medicine in New Mexico.

Dr. Romine **SECONDED** the motion. **YES:** Kovnat, Heim, Romine, Boshier, Ghadimi and Weiner. **MOTION CARRIED.**

Dr. Kovnat **MOVED** to Order Respondent's license to practice medicine in New Mexico be suspended for two years, during which time he is not eligible to practice in New Mexico. Respondent may petition the Board for reinstatement of his license on the condition information is provided regarding past work history for last two years. Dr. Romine **SECONDED** the motion. **YES:** Kovnat, Heim, Romine, Boshier, Ghadimi, and Weiner. **MOTION CARRIED.**

**3. ADJOURN.** There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

**SUBMITTED:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Charlotte Kinney, Executive Director**

**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**C. Grant La Farge, M.D., Secretary**

**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**John Romine, M.D., President**