1 2 3 4 5	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California E. A. JONES, III, Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice 300 South Spring Street, Suite 5212 Los Angeles, California 90013-1204 Telephone: (213) 897-2543 Attorneys for Complainant	
7 8 9	BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11 12 13 14 15 16	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:  LAWSON ALOZIE AKPULONU, M.D. P.O. Box 341528 Los Angeles, CA 90034  Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A-31917,  Respondent.  Respondent.	
18	FINDINGS OF FACT	
19	1. On or about February 28, 1995, Complainant Dixon	
20	Arnett, in his official capacity as Executive Director of the	
21	Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs,	
22	State of California, filed Accusation No. 17-95-46707 against	
23	Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. (hereinafter "respondent") before	
24	the Division of Medical Quality (hereinafter the "Division").	
25	2. On or about March 1, 1995, Tom Buck, an employee of	
26	the California Department of Justice, sent by certified mail a	

27 copy of Accusation No. 17-95-46707, Statement to Respondent,

Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7, Notice of Defense forms, and a Request for Discovery to respondent's address of record with the Board which was and is 5443 West Washington Blvd., Los Angeles, 90016. Respondent was also served at P.O. Box 341528, Los Angeles, CA 90034. On or about April 3, 1995, the Domestic Return Receipts were signed by respondent and returned to the Department of Justice. On the return receipt for 5443 West Washington Blvd., the address of P.O. Box 341528, Los Angeles, CA 90034 was placed by the post office over the 5443 West Washington Blvd. address. Since on or about March 8, 1995, respondent has had on file with the United States Post Office a mail forwarding order directing that mail for 5443 West Washington Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90016, be forwarded to P.O. Box 341528, Los Angeles, CA 90034. (See "Appendix E," Attachment 2 to Declaration.) A copy of the Accusation, the pleading packet, Declaration of Service and postal returned receipts are attached hereto as "Appendix A," and they are incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

26

- 3. On or about April 10, 1995, Complainant Dixon Arnett, in his official capacity as Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California, filed a Supplemental Accusation in Case No. 17-95-46707 against respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. before the Division.
- 4. On or about April 11, 1995, Tom Buck, an employee of the California Department of Justice, sent by certified mail a copy of the Supplemental Accusation in Case No. 17-95-46707 and a

Supplemental Statement to Respondent to respondent's address of P.O. Box 341528, Los Angeles, CA 90034. On or about April 14, 1995, the Domestic Return Receipt was signed by respondent and returned to the Department of Justice. Respondent's attorney was also served. A copy of the Supplemental Accusation, the Supplemental Statement to Respondent, Declaration of Service, and postal returned receipts are attached hereto as "Appendix B," and they are incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

1.3

- 5. On or about March 28, 1995, respondent filed a Notice of Defense in which W. Phillip Higgins was designated as respondent's attorney. A copy of the Notice of Defense is attached hereto as "Appendix C," and is incorporated as if fully set forth herein.
- 6. On or about May 19, 1995, a Notice of Hearing was served on respondent to respondent's address of P.O. Box 341528, Los Angeles, CA 90034, and also on his attorney by U.S. Mail. A copy of the Notice of Hearing and Declaration of Service are attached hereto as "Appendix D," and are incorporated as if fully set forth herein. See the Declaration of Deputy Attorney General E. A. Jones, III, attached hereto as "Appendix E," and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.
- 7. A hearing was convened on October 30, 1995, at the time and location indicated in the Notice of Hearing referred to in paragraph 6 above. Neither respondent nor any attorney representing him appeared at the hearing and nor otherwise contacted the Office of Administrative Hearings or the Deputy Attorney General assigned to the case. See the Declaration of

Deputy Attorney General E. A. Jones, III attached hereto as "Appendix E."

- 8. The above-described service was effective as a matter of law pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
- 9. On February 16, 1978, the Medical Board of California issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No.
  A-31917 to respondent. Respondent's license was suspended pursuant to Government Code section 11529 on or about February 17, 1995. On or about April 30, 1995, respondent's certificate expired. A certificate of licensure is attached hereto as "Appendix F," and is incorporated as if fully set forth herein.
- 10. Business and Professions Code section 118
  provides, in pertinent part:
  - "(b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the license on any such ground."
- 11. Government Code section 11506 provides, in pertinent part:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 12. Government Code section 11520 provides, in pertinent part:
  - "(a) If the respondent 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; . . . . "
- Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Division finds that as a result of his failure to appear at the scheduled hearing the respondent is in default and that he has waived his right to a hearing to contest the allegations in Accusation No. 17-95-46707 and the Supplemental Accusation in Case No. 17-95-46707. The Division will take action without further hearing and, based on the respondent's admissions by way of default and the evidence before it, as contained in Appendix G, finds that the allegations, and each of them, contained in Accusation No. 17-95-46707 and the Supplemental Accusation in Case No. 17-95-46707 are true.

## **DETERMINATION OF ISSUES**

Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. has 1.

1	subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate to		
2	disciplinary action pursuant to sections 2220, 2227 and 2234 of		
3	the California Business and Professions Code by reason of the		
4	Finding of Facts numbers 1 through 13, above.		
5	2. Service of the Accusation, Supplemental Accusation		
6	and related documents, including the Notice of Hearing, was		
7	proper and in accordance with the law.		
8	3. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this		
9	case by default.		
10			
11	DECISION AND ORDER OF THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY		
12	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA		
13	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate number A-31917,		
14	heretofore issued to respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D., is		
15	hereby revoked. An effective date of February 7, 1996, has been		
16	assigned to this Order.		
17	Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision		
18	(b), respondent is entitled to make any showing by way of		
19	mitigation; however, such showing must be made in writing and		
20	received by the Division at least five (5) days prior to the		
21	effective date of this decision.		
22	Made this 8th day of January , 1996.		
23			
24	In harliel		
25	FOR THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA		
26			
	Attachments: Appendices A through F and Appendix G, Evidence		

03573160-LA95AD0281 c:\wp\cases\akpu2\def.de2

27

Packet

1	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California		
2	E. A. JONES, III,		
3	Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice		
4	300 South Spring Street, Suite 5212 Los Angeles, California 90013-1204		
5	Telephone: (213) 897-2543		
6	Attorneys for Complainant		
7	BEFORE THE	OTIAT IMM	
8	DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation )	NO. 17-95-46707	
12	Against: )	OAH NO. L-9502120	
13	LAWSON ALOZIE AKPULONU, M.D. ) P.O. Box 341528 )	ACCUSATION	
14	Los Angeles, CA 90034 )		
15	Physician's and Surgeon's ) Certificate No. A-31917,		
16	Respondent.		
17	······································		
18	The Complainant alleges:		
19	<u>PARTIES</u>		
20	1. Complainant, Dixon Arne	tt, is the Executive	
21	Director of the Medical Board of Calif	ornia, Department of	
22	Consumer Affairs, State of California	<pre>(hereinafter the "Board")</pre>	
23	and brings this accusation solely in h	is official capacity.	
24	2. On or about February 16	, 1978, Physician's and	
25	Surgeon's Certificate No. A-31917 was	issued by the Board to	
26	Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. (hereinaf	ter "respondent"), and at	
27	all times relevant to the charges brou	ght herein, this license	

has been in full force and effect. Unless renewed, it will expire on April 30, 1995.

## JURISDICTION

- 3. This accusation is brought before the Medical Board of California, Division of Medical Quality, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California (hereinafter the "Board" or "Division"), under the authority of the following sections of the California Business and Professions Code (hereinafter "Code"):
  - A. Section 2227 of the Code provides that the Division may revoke, suspend for a period not to exceed one year, or place on probation, the license of any licensee who has been found quilty under the Medical Practice Act.
  - B. Section 2234 of the Code provides that unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
    - "(b) Gross negligence.
    - (c) Repeated negligent acts."
  - C. Section 726 of the Code provides that the commission of any act of sexual abuse, misconduct, or relations with a patient, client or customer which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the occupation for which a license was issued constitutes unprofessional conduct and grounds for disciplinary action for any person licensed under this division, under any initiative act referred to this division and under Chapter 17 (commencing with Section 9000) of Division 3.

In 1993, the first paragraph of section 726 was amended to delete the words, "which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the occupation for which a license was issued." (Stats. 1993, c. 1072, §1.)

D. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct any licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act, to pay the Board a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

2.2

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Gross Negligence)

- 4. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234(b) of the Business and Professions Code in that he was grossly negligent in the care and treatment of patient A.A. The circumstances are as follows:
  - A. On or about January 28, 1995, patient A.A. went to the Midland Medical Center, located at 10826 Venice Boulevard, Culver City, Ca 90230, where respondent was employed. While under anesthesia, following an abortion procedure that respondent performed on her, patient A.A. awoke to find respondent raping her; he had penetrated her vagina with his penis. Respondent gave patient A.A. a shot and she went back to sleep. When patient A.A. woke up a second time, she saw respondent next to her. She saw his erect penis out of his pants. She tried to push him away.

She felt his erect penis when she pushed him away. 1 Respondent then gave her another shot and she went back to 2 When patient A.A. awoke for a third time, she found 3 her sweater had been removed and her bra partially pulled 4 down exposing her right breast. Respondent was caressing 5 At one point, when patient A.A. tried 6 patient A.A.'s body. to scream, respondent placed his hand over her mouth. 7 Respondent told patient A.A. she had a beautiful body. He 8 said she was a very nice girl and a very sexy girl while he 9 continued rubbing her inside her blouse and bra. He kissed 10 her right breast. He then placed his business card inside 11 12 her bra and said she could call him anytime.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- B. Respondent's touching and fondling of patient A.A. and penetration of her with his penis on January 28, 1995 was an extreme departure from the standard of care and constituted gross negligence.
- C. Respondent's statements to A.A. on January 28, 1995 that she was a very sexy girl and that she could call him anytime were, under the circumstances, extreme departures from the standard of care and constituted gross negligence.
- D. Respondent's exposing of his penis to patient A.A. on January 28, 1995 was an extreme departure from the standard of care and represented gross negligence.
- E. Respondent's failure to have a chaperon present for the procedure on patient A.A. on January 28, 1995 was an extreme departure from the standard of care and

represented gross negligence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- F. The number of injections given by respondent to patient A.A. for the procedure on January 28, 1995 and the length of the procedure were grossly out of proportion to the norm and represent an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 5. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234(b) of the Business and Professions Code in that he was grossly negligent in the care and treatment of patient T.O. The circumstances are as follows:
  - On or about November 9, 1992, patient T.O. went to the clinic of Lawson Akpulonu, M.D. for a The clinic was located at 9236 Long therapeutic abortion. Beach Blvd., South Gate, California. When she was in the operating room at the clinic, respondent gave her a shot that was supposed to put her to sleep during the operation. She was very drowsy but never fell asleep. After respondent gave her the shot, he ordered the nurse who was present to leave the room. Respondent then performed the operation. Immediately after the abortion, respondent began to massage patient T.O.'s vagina with his hand. Patient T.O. began to cry. Respondent also began to rub her thighs and buttocks and he fondled her breasts through her blouse. respondent was touching her breasts, she could feel him rub his groin up against her exposed vagina. He had his pants Patient T.O. continued to cry. on at the time. She asked respondent what he was doing and pushed his hand away.

Respondent then left the room and patient T.O. did not see him again. A short time later the nurse came back into the room and gave the patient some follow-up instructions. She then put her pants on and left the clinic with the person who had brought her.

- B. Conducting the termination procedure on or about November 9, 1992, under anesthesia without a chaperon present was an extreme departure from the standard of care by respondent and constituted gross negligence.
- C. Respondent's fondling of patient T.O's breasts and touching her vagina and other parts of her body and his rubbing his crotch against patient T.O.'s exposed vagina on or about November 9, 1992, were extreme departures from the standard of care and constituted gross negligence.
- 6. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234(b) of the Business and Professions Code in that he was grossly negligent in the care and treatment of patient D.L. The circumstances are as follows:
  - A. On or about June 22, 1994 patient D.L. first went to see Dr. Lawson Akpulonu at his Culver City clinic for a termination of pregnancy. At the two week follow-up appointment on July 7, 1994 at a different clinic of respondent, she was told by respondent that she had HPV (human papilloma virus). On July 14, 1994 patient D.L. went to the Washington Blvd. clinic of respondent and he performed a colposcopy exam on her. During the examination, the phone rang and the respondent told his assistant to

27

answer the phone, leaving her alone with the respondent for the rest of the examination. After the exam, patient D.L. met with respondent in his office to discuss the results. He told her that her infection was very severe and that it would cost \$1500.00 for laser treatments. She began to cry when she learned the cost. He said what she had was treatable and that was more important than the money. also said, "Don't worry, I like you, I'll do anything for you." On or about July 22, 1994 patient D.L. went to respondent for the laser treatment. When she was in the examination room with respondent and the nurse at the beginning of the procedure before she was put to sleep, respondent told the nurse to leave and get something. nurse then left the room. Patient D.L. went to sleep after The procedure lasted an hour and a half. that. D.L. does not know if the nurse was present during the procedure. On Tuesday, August 2, 1994, patient D.L. had her fifth visit with respondent. When she arrived at the clinic, the respondent, who was consulting with another patient, came to take her blood himself. The nurse returned to the front desk. He put his right hand on patient D.L.'s left shoulder and firmly squeezed it. He then proceeded with the blood test. He wrapped a latex rubber glove around He had apparently run out of tourniquets. As the glove was tightened around her arm, two fingers of the glove blew into shape. Patient D.L. tapped the two fingers humorously. Then respondent tapped the fingers referring to them as penises by saying, "This one's Chinese, and this one's Vietnamese." After he made this comment, respondent The nurse who was down the hall could no closed the door. longer see them. He then finished the blood test. After respondent finished the blood test, patient D.L. got up to walk out the door. As she reached for the door knob, respondent from behind her put both of his hands firmly on her waist and pulled her back close towards him. She was confused. She turned her head and saw him smiling. said "No" and freed herself from his hold and opened the door. A short time later she confronted him and said, "I didn't like what happened in the hallway. It shouldn't have happened. You crossed that line of trust between patient and doctor." He then replied, "What are you talking about?" She said, "You know exactly what happened. You grabbed me by the waist and pulled me close to you." He said, "Is that what this is all about? I'm sorry if you confused my holding your shoulders for your waist." Patient D.L. subsequently left the clinic.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- B. The statement of respondent that he liked the patient and would do anything for the patient represented an extreme departure from the standard of care since it was made with a sexual innuendo.
- C. Respondent's examination of the patient on July 14, 1994 without a chaperon present was an extreme departure from the standard of care and constituted gross negligence.

,

D. Respondent's drawing blood from the patient on August 2, 1994 without a chaperon present was an extreme departure from the standard of care and constituted gross negligence.

- E. Respondent's statement on August 2, 1994 to patient D.L. comparing an inflated glove's digits to penises was an extreme departure from the standard of care and represented gross negligence.
- F. Respondent's squeezing of patient D.L.'s shoulder and later pulling her against him, both occurring on August 2, 1994, were extreme departures from the standard of care and constituted gross negligence.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Sexual Misconduct)

- 7. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 726 of the Business and Professions Code in that he engaged in sexual misconduct with, sexual abuse of, and/or sexual relations with patient A.A. The circumstances are as follows:
  - A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraph 4 above are incorporated here as if fully set forth here.
- 8. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 726 of the Business and Professions Code in that he engaged in sexual misconduct with and/or sexual abuse of patient T.O. The circumstances are as

follows:

- A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraph 5 above are incorporated here as if fully set forth here.
- 9. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 726 of the Business and Professions Code in that he engaged in sexual misconduct with and/or sexual abuse of patient D.L. The circumstances are as follows:
  - A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraph 6 above are incorporated here as if fully set forth here.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 10. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234(c) of the Business and Professions Code in that he engaged in repeated acts of negligence in the care and treatment of patient A.A. The circumstances are as follows:
  - A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraph 4 above are incorporated here as if fully set forth here.
- 11. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234(c) of the Business and Professions Code in that he engaged in repeated acts of negligence in the care and treatment of patient T.O. The

circumstances are as follows:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraph 5 above are incorporated here as if fully set forth here.
- 12. Respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234(c) of the Business and Professions Code in that he engaged in repeated acts of negligence in the care and treatment of patient D.L. The circumstances are as follows:
  - A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraph 6 above are incorporated here as if fully set forth here.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board issue a decision:

- Revoking or suspending License Number A-31917, heretofore issued to respondent Lawson Alozie Akpulonu, M.D.;
- 2. Ordering respondent to pay the Board the actual and reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case; and

23 | ////

24 | ////

25 | ////

26 1///

27 1////

1	3. Taking such other and further action as the Board
2	deems proper.
3	DATED: $2/28/95$ .
4	
5	Alexander
6	Ja Dixon Arnett
7	Executive Director  Medical Board of California
8	Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
9	Complainant
10	c:\wp\cases\akpu2\acc
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	