

Source: <http://blog.abolishhumanabortion.com/2011/06/abortionist-report-naresh-patel-md.html?m=1>

## [Abortionist Report: Naresh Patel, M.D.](#)



The intention of this post is to summarize the lawsuits brought against Naresh Patel since 1989. Patel is the doctor at [Outpatient Services for Women](#) in Oklahoma City, OK. The clinic's address is: 6112 N.W. 63rd Street, Oklahoma City, OK 73132

I used [The Oklahoma State Courts Network](#) website to begin my research and completed my research by obtaining the actual files connected to the court dockets through his [county court clerk's office](#).

At least twenty lawsuits have been filed against Naresh Patel since 1989. Below, we list all and summarize some of those twenty suits with quotations from the plaintiffs' allegations. The allegations are divided into five categories: ***sexual battery, protective order, assault and battery, malpractice, and negligence.***

***Warning: Some of the content below is very graphic. Accounts of alleged sexual abuse and abortion complications are quoted without censorship of explicit content.***

### **Sexual Battery**

**CF-1993-3144**

In 1993 charges for a criminal felony were filed against Dr. Patel on two counts. The first count was for forcible oral sodomy. The second count was for sexual battery.

Below we summarize the prosecution's case and each victim's testimony with quotations from the trial:

*"They were all three slim and pretty, attractive females. All three of them went to Dr. Nareshkum Patel...seeking abortions; and in fact, on the days they were sexually assaulted, did in fact all three of them get abortions from Dr. Nareshkum Patel."*

### **Victim #1**

While she sat in a chair recovering from her abortion this victim alleges, *"he then started using his penis to rub my hand."* After she moved her hand away, she told him she was cold. He brought her back to his office and she dozed off in one of his chairs. *"When I woke up, I felt like two hands in my mouth trying to open it wide. Then I felt another sensation in my mouth."* When asked what was causing the sensation in her mouth she replied, *"Dr. Patel's penis."* When she turned her face away, the victim, *"saw him discharge some white substance coming out. And he rushed to the bathroom."*

### **Victim #2**

After being drugged substantially and brought to an exam room, the victim claimed she heard his pants unzip and observed him pulling down his pants. When asked what followed, the victim said, *"I felt Dr. Patel enter my rectum with his penis."* After Dr. Patel allegedly raped the victim he called the nurse back in to help perform the abortion. When she woke up, *"His penis was in my mouth."* When she finally awoke she was in severe pain and was bleeding profusely. She eventually discovered, *"I had a tampon in my vagina, and I had a tampon in my rectum."*

### **Victim #3**

After this victim was given an injection of an unidentified substance, Dr. Patel allegedly began to fondle the victim's breasts. Then he had her scoot down to the end of the table. The victim goes on to say, *"Right after that, I heard the zipper of his pants, and he started moving back and forth. And I felt the pressure inside of me."* When the victim was asked *"what part of you?"* She replied, *"My vagina."* After Dr. Patel allegedly raped the victim, he called the nurse back in to assist in performing an abortion on the Plaintiff. This victim came forward after seeing on the news a few years later that Patel had allegedly done this to someone else.

### **Acquitted Despite Evidence?**

Dr. Patel denied all of the allegations made against him. In the end Dr. Patel was found not guilty by a jury.

Dr. Patel claimed to have not given the first victim an abortion when she came in, though he did admit that she called the office the following day because she was experiencing heavy bleeding. Patel dismissed this as a miscarriage, though the heavy bleeding seems to indicate that she did have an abortion the day before.

In an Affidavit For Search Warrant of Patel's clinic the Affiant wrote:

*“On 04-06-93 [Victim 1] had a telephone conversation with Dr. Patel. [Victim 1] tape recorded this conversation. During this conversation [Victim 1] asked Dr. Patel why he didn’t prescribe any medications for her. [Victim 1] asked Dr. Patel if he is mad at her for not putting his “prick” in her mouth. To this Dr. Patel replied, “No. No.” The tape recording of this conversation was turned over to me. On 05-14-93, [Victim 1] had another telephone conversation with Dr. Patel, which was also taped. During this conversation [Victim 1] asks Dr. Patel to apologize for putting his “prick” in her mouth. To this Dr. Patel replied, “Okay, I am sorry. Okay?” The tape of this conversation was also turned over to me.”*

Result: Dr. Patel was acquitted on all counts because the jury submitted a “not guilty” verdict for the two charges brought against him.



This is a screenshot from Patel's Abortion Services homepage. (click to enlarge)

## Protective Order

### PO-2002-2883

In 2002 a former employee of Naresh Patel filed a protective order against him. The order was filed on October 3 and was granted on October 17. Below we transcribe her complaint in it’s entirety:

*“I was receptionist at a Abortion Clinic and a patient was very irritable for obvious reasons, and I tried to explained to her that she needed to get a pregnancy test from a Doctor’s Office, and she was refusing to get one, she she started an argument, so the*

*Dr. Patel came to me very aggressively and pushed me hard in front of all people and not just pushed me, He yell and scream at me and humiliated me, in fact one of the employees that was in front of us told him not to pushed me, he had no right to do it, so he didn't even let me explain that the patient was overreacting because she didn't want to pay the pregnancy test, so the patient accused me of threatened her, I just told her me and the other employee that it was necessary and a requirement by the law of Oklahoma to have pregnancy so she called me incompetent; The Doctor never apologized for misstreat me and I was crying the whole time because her treated me so bad, so I got in to the ladies room and stayed for 15 min and he suddenly opened the door without knocking, I felt harassed even if I wasn't using the toilette, I just gave him the money of all the patients and told him I'm not crying because of you, I'm crying because nobody will treat me like this, so he told me If you don't like the way I treat you don't ever work here, so I just told him of course I won't work her no more."*

Result: This protective order was granted.

## **Assault and Battery**

### **CJ-2003-8357**

In 2003 the former employee that filed a protective order in 2002 filed a lawsuit against Patel for assault and battery. We quote from her allegations:

*"On or about October 3, 2002, the Defendant, Dr. Naresh Patel, unlawfully battered the Plaintiff...by placing his hands upon the Plaintiff's body and pushing her backwards with great force and violence."*

Result: There was an "order of dismissal" by the court because of the Plaintiff's "failure to prosecute diligently."

## **Personal Injury**

### **CJ-1989-10604**

Result: Final Judgement (Non-Jury Trial)

### **CJ-1995-2**

This Plaintiff sued Dr. Patel because of the complications she suffered from the abortion he performed. She complained that the risks were not enumerated properly in order to comply with "informed consent." She also complained that Patel was not prepared to "competently treat a complication of this magnitude." We quote the from the Defendant's allegations:

#### **The Initial Injury**

*"That the Defendant doctor caused serious, painful and life threatening injury to the Plaintiff, by his improper, careless or otherwise deficient use of a medical device during the procedure, resulted in an unintended six (6) centimeter cervical laceration and the resulting loss of massive amounts of blood. The attending Defendant doctor failed to immediately observe the damage he had done or to properly attend the Plaintiff patient post-operatively as is usually and normally conducted in surgical procedures. The*

*Defendant doctor failed to properly assess the risks involved in the procedure he had agreed to perform and to then take the necessary steps to prevent or to treat immediately the reasonably foreseeable complications or risks in the event such a problem occurred.*

*As a result of the foregoing acts and/or omissions the Plaintiff suffered grievous injury to the mind and body and her injuries were painful and permanent, for which she should be compensated in money damages. The Plaintiff as additional damages incurred considerable medical expenses in an attempt to repair the damage done by the Defendant doctor and to save her life.”*

### **Unable to Treat Injury**

*“Additionally, the form fails to state the lack of hospital privileges of the attending Defendant doctor or that if such a complication occurs that the Plaintiff patient will have to be transferred to another facility for treatment by another physician. The form fails to warn the patient that the transfer may be by ambulance and that, therefore, the Defendant has not control over response time and that such a deficiency may be life-threatening or fatal. The form fails to state that the patient will have to be treated by a physician who is unfamiliar with the precise causes of the complication and/or emergency and that additional time will be required by that physician to diagnose the condition before commencing any treatment, which may thereby have a deleterious result on the successful treatment of the emergency.”*

Result: Dismissed with Prejudice

### **CJ-1995-3995**

In this case the Plaintiff sued Patel for poorly placing a “Norplant” birth control device. She also sued him for not warning her of the risks/side-effects that are associated with this birth control device.

Result: Dismissed by court because the Plaintiff “failed to issue summons.”

### **CJ-1989-6283**

Result: Dismissed with Prejudice by the court.

### **CJ-1994-3764**

The Plaintiff sued Patel for malpractice and negligence that resulted in a number of emergency procedures.

We quote from the Plaintiff’s allegations:

### **First Examination**

*“On or about Friday, May 26, 1994, [Plaintiff] visited Clinic and was admitted by defendants as patient of defendants. Dr. Patel physically examine [Plaintiff] and had ultra-sound performed on [Plaintiff]. During the ultra-sound operation, Dr. Patel showed screen to [Plaintiff] and explained that [Plaintiff] was pregnant for a period exceeding*

fourteen (14) weeks. Dr. Patel demanded [Plaintiff] pay Dr. Patel and additional seventy five (\$75.00) dollars and told [Plaintiff] that [Plaintiff] should return the next day for an abortion.

### **Day of the Abortion**

*“[Plaintiff] returned to Clinic the next day, in accordance with Dr. Patel’s instructions. [Plaintiff] was taken into Clinic by agents of Dr. Patel and was asked by Dr. Patel as to whether or not [Plaintiff] had previously received caesarean section birth delivery. [Plaintiff] replied that she had twice before received medical services leading to caesarean birth. [Plaintiff] then asked Dr. Patel whether or not that would create any problem or danger for an abortion. Dr. Patel replied that the caesarean births would create no such problem or danger and that everything would be alright.”*

*Dr. Patel then immediately, with the assistance of the agents and employees of defendants, proceeded to perform an abortion. Defendants negligently and with gross recklessness injured [Plaintiff] during attempted abortion procedures.”*

### **Refusing to Call for Help**

*“Before summoning emergency medical personnel, in an attempt to reduce defendants’ liability, Dr. Patel and the employees of defendants physically awoke Osborn and demanded to know whether or not [Plaintiff] had previously bled profusely. [Plaintiff], who was suffering from profound injuries to her person, lying on the surgical table responded that she had not.*

*Defendant Dr. Patel then began to summon emergency medical services summoned to take [Plaintiff] to a more adequately staffed and equipped emergency facility. Defendant Dr. Patel abandoned [Plaintiff] at the surgical table and went to the telephone to call for an ambulance himself. Several minutes later, defendant Dr. Patel still had not called an ambulance, when a personal friend of [Plaintiff] entered Dr. Patel’s office and demanded emergency medical treatment be summoned for [Plaintiff]. At the insistence of said friend of [Plaintiff], Dr. Patel finally called emergency services and police and ambulances immediately responded.”*

### **Life Saving Surgery**

*“[Plaintiff] was taken to Deaconess Hospital in Oklahoma City and her life saved by emergency surgical procedures. [Plaintiff]’s surgeon at Deaconess Hospital performed scopic surgery and determined that immediate surgery was required to save [Plaintiff]’s life. [Surgeon] necessarily removed the uterus of [Plaintiff] in a partial hysterectomy, without the opportunity to first ask [Plaintiff] or her family for guidance. The emergency procedures, including the partial hysterectomy, performed by [Surgeon] and Deaconess Hospital were necessary to save the life of [Plaintiff] and were directly the consequence of the negligence and malpractice of defendants.”*

Result: Voluntary Dismissal

### **CJ-1993-3012**

Result: Dismissed with Prejudice by the court.

## Malpractice

### **CJ-1992-8225**

Result: Dismissed without Prejudice by the court.

### **CJ-1992-9042**

Result: Dismissed with Prejudice by the court.

### **CJ-1993-2318**

Result: Dismissed with Prejudice by the court.

### **CJ-1993-2525**

Result: Dismissed by the court.

### **CJ-1993-4153**

Result: Dismissed with Prejudice by the court.

### **CJ-1993-4528**

Result: Dismissed without Prejudice

### **CJ-1994-1665**

Plaintiff sued Patel for performing a failed abortion on her. She also sued her private doctor for failing to detect her pregnancy before inserting a Norplant contraceptive device. We quote from her allegations to clarify:

#### **Failed Abortion**

*“Plaintiff was tested for pregnancy on or about November 22, 1991, at Outpatient Services for Women. The result of the test was positive, indicating a pregnancy of 5-6 weeks. That on or about November 26, 1991, Plaintiff returned to Outpatient Services for Women to obtain an abortion and termination of pregnancy. The procedure was performed by Defendant Patel.”*

#### **Birth Control**

*“Plaintiff returned to her private doctor...for a post abortion checkup and insertion of Norplant contraceptive devices. Plaintiff was examined by Defendant [Private Doctor] on or about December 2, 1991, at which time the Norplant was inserted, and an ultrasound performed. The ultrasound was not interpreted by the radiologist at the time.”*

#### **The Discovery**

*“That on or about March 9, 1992, Plaintiff was seen again by Defendant [Private Doctor], and an ultrasound was performed and interpreted resulting in notification to the Plaintiff that she was approximately 20 weeks pregnant. Plaintiff was advised by Defendant [Private Doctor] that she was pregnant on or about December 2, 1991 when the Norplant was inserted and that the pregnancy had been missed at the time. That on or about March 12, 1992, Plaintiff was examined at Aaron Women’s Health Center in Dallas, Texas. Plaintiff was advised that the age of the fetus, approximately twenty-two (22) weeks.”*

Result: Dismissed by court because Plaintiff did not “diligently prosecute.”

### **CJ-1994-5938**

The Plaintiff alleged that Dr. Patel was negligent in the medical care he provided in performing an abortion on the Plaintiff.

We quote from the Plaintiff's allegations:

*"On the 16th Day of June 1994, the Plaintiff employed the Defendant to perform an abortion to terminate her pregnancy.*

*Defendant advised the Plaintiff that typically two (2) medical instruments would be implanted one day prior to an abortion being performed, but that the Defendant decided he would do the abortion the same day. Defendant informed Plaintiff that his decision to perform the abortion immediately was based on the fact that the Plaintiff's pregnancy was further along than Defendant had expected. After the Defendant had completed the abortion, he instructed the Plaintiff to go home and return to his office in two (2) weeks.*

*As a result of the abortion, Plaintiff suffered excruciating pain to her body, tremendous loss of blood, loss of hearing and discharge of fetal matter. The pain and loss suffered by Plaintiff has caused her severe mental and emotional distress and permanent physical impairment."*

Result: Dismissed by the court.

#### **CJ-1994-3232**

The Plaintiff alleged that Dr. Patel was negligent in the medical care he provided in performing an abortion on the Plaintiff.

We quote from the Plaintiff's allegations:

*"That on or about July 8, 1993, Plaintiff...was treated as the Defendant Outpatient Services for Women by Defendant Patel. That Defendant Patel performed an abortion on Plaintiff. That the procedure was performed negligently by Defendant Patel resulting in substantial injury to Plaintiff. That Defendant Patel's treatment and care of Plaintiff...was below the prevailing standard of care in the community.*

*That as a direct and proximate result of the defendant's negligent care of the Plaintiff...she has and will incur medical expenses and substantial pain of mind and body. Plaintiff's injuries are permanent and painful. That the aforementioned acts were performed in reckless and gross disregard of the rights of the plaintiff. Because of the acts and conduct of the defendant, an award of exemplary damages is properly recoverable by the Plaintiff, which will serve to deter the defendant and others from like or similar conduct in the future."*

Result: Dismissed by Plaintiff without Prejudice.

#### **CJ-2000-6143**

The Plaintiff alleged that Patel provided her an abortion that was "below the medical standard." We quote from the Plaintiff's allegations:

*"During that operation, the defendant rendered care and treatment that was below the medical standard established in the medical community of Oklahoma City. Defendant's*



*negligence caused the plaintiff to bleed excessively and as a result had to be transported to Deaconess Hospital by ambulance. As a result of defendant's negligence the plaintiff suffered severe emotional distress, pain and suffering and permanent injuries."*

Result: Dismissed without prejudice "for failure to issue summons."

## **Negligence**

### **CJ-1994-2106**

The Plaintiff alleged two causes of action. The first, was that Patel was negligent in the care he provided the Plaintiff and because of this she suffered terribly. The second, was for allegedly burning multiple fetuses in an open field. We quote from the Plaintiff's allegations to clarify:

#### **The Negligence**

*"The care provided to the Plaintiff by the Defendants, and each of them, fell below acceptable established standards in the medical community, and in fact amounted to the absence of even slight care. As a result of the foregoing, the Plaintiff suffered great pain of the body and mind, and incurred medical expenses."*

#### **Burning Fetuses in an Open Field**

*"The Defendant, NARESHKUMAR PATEL, M.D., on or about the 25th day of June, 1992, did cause the incomplete incineration of multiple fetuses at a certain location in Shawnee, Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma. The incineration was accomplished in an open field in plain view of the general public.*

*The Defendant...from that time forward, wholly failed, refused and neglected to contact the Plaintiff and notify her that her fetus, which had been aborted approximately ninety (90) days earlier, was or was not one of the fetuses which he had incinerated as herein alleged.*

*As a result of the foregoing, the Plaintiff verily believes that her aborted fetus was among those having been incinerated or partially incinerated as herein alleged, resulting in the infliction, either intentionally or in a grossly negligent manner, of extreme emotional distress by the Defendant...upon the Plaintiff."*

Result: Final Judgement; Dismissed with Prejudice (Non-Jury Trial)

USA Today newspaper, April 17, 1992:



## Oklahoma Medical Board Disciplinary History

In 1990 Dr. Patel has been reprimanded once for unprofessional conduct by the Oklahoma Medical Board. They described his unprofessional conduct this way: *"Failing to maintain dispensing records for dangerous drugs and keep complete and accurate records of purchase and dispensing of controlled drugs."*

### Guide to Interpreting These Lawsuits

All of this information is public and can be obtained from the Oklahoma County Court Clerk's office. None of the lawsuits filed against Dr. Naresh Patel, M.D. ended in him being found guilty of the charges alleged against him. Most of these suits were dismissed by the court which can mean several things. First, it can mean that the plaintiff did not file her suit properly and there was a mistrial. Second, it can mean that the plaintiff's allegations were not sufficiently substantiated by evidence. Third, it can mean that there is no legal remedy to the plaintiff's complaint. Fourth, it can mean that the plaintiff failed to order a summons to continue prosecution and therefore the trial was dismissed. The last reason was why most of the suits against Patel were dismissed.

Though most of these cases were dismissed for a number of different reasons, it is important to note the vast quantity of women who, at the very least, believe they have been harmed by Naresh Patel. Sixteen of the lawsuits pertained to damages that allegedly resulted from a "safe medical procedure," performed by Dr. Patel.

The main point that needs to be grasped is that **there are serious risks involved in obtaining an abortion**. Sometimes women suffer terrible complications from obtaining an abortion. These complications can range from sterility to serious psychological trauma to death.

Consider other options for the sake of your health and safety. If you choose to keep your baby, there are many people out there willing to help you through this difficult time. If you do choose to put your baby up for adoption, there are many families waiting to adopt and organizations that can help you through that process.