# These charges are only allegations which may be contested by the licensee in an administrative hearing. 

## STATE OF NEW YORK : DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

STATE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL MEDICAL CONDUCT

IN THE MATTER
OF
MATTHEW J. KACHINAS, M.D.
CO-10-04-2680-A

## STATEMENT

OF
CHARGES

MATTHEW J. KACHINAS, M.D., Respondent, was authorized to practice medicine in New York state on August 5, 1988, by the issuance of license number 175701 by the New York State Education Department.

## FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. On or about April 16, 2010, the State of Florida, Board of Medicine (hereinafter "Florida Board"), by a Final Order (hereinafter "Florida Order"), inter alia, revoked Respondent's license to practice medicine, and required him to pay a $\$ 5,500.00$ fines and $\$ 37,157.76$ costs, and placed Respondent on probation for one year based on Respondent removing drugs from vials and transporting them from one clinic to another; failure to document the administration of drugs he removed from one clinic to another and failure to justify the course of treatment; his failure to include cause of fetal death on a death certificate, failure to include elective termination of pregnancy by Digoxin of the fetal death certificate; failure to keep legible medical records documenting justification of course of treatment; falsifying fetal death certificate, failure to document time of fetal demise; failure to identify the position of twin A (male) the affected twin, failure to clearly differentiate the sex of the fetus by ultrasound; identifying the anomalies of the affected twin; performing feticide on a non-affected fetus; failure to document attempts to identify sex or multiple anomalies of affected twin A.
B. On or about December 9, 2011, the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, (hereinafter California Board), revoked Respondent's Physician and Surgeons Certificate, based on the Final Order issued by the Florida Board in " $A$ " above.
C. The conduct resulting in the Florida Board disciplinary action against Respondent would constitute misconduct under the laws of New York state, pursuant to the following sections of New York state law:

1. New York Education Law §6530(9)(d).
D. The conduct resulting in the California Board disciplinary action against Respondent would constitute misconduct under the laws of New York state, pursuant to the following sections of New York state law:
2. New York Education Law $\S 6530(9)(d)$.

## SPECIFICATIONS

## FIRST SPECIFICATION

Respondent violated New York State Education Law $\S 6530$ (9)(b), in that Petitioner charges:

1. The facts in Paragraph A .

## SECOND SPECIFICATION

Respondent violated New York Education Law $\mathrm{§}^{6530(9)(\mathrm{d}) \text { by having disciplinary action }}$ taken by a duly authorized disciplinary agency of another state, where the conduct resulting in the disciplinary action would, if committed in New York state, constitute professional misconduct under the laws of New York state, in that Petitioner charges:
2. The facts in Paragraphs A, B, and/or C.

DATED: Mey 24.2012 Albany, New York

REDACTED
PETER D. VAN BUREN Deputy Counsel
Bureau of Professional Medical Conduct

