IN AND BEFORE THE OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL LICENSURE AND SUPERVISION STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel.)	
THE OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD)	
OF MEDICAL LICENSURE AND)	
SUPERVISION,)	
Plaintiff,)	MEE
)	
VS.)	Case
)	
JEROME EDWARD BLOCK, M.D.)	
LICENSE NO. 22665)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MAY 2 3 2014

FILED

OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL LICENSURE & SUPERVISION

Case No. 13-05-4746

COMPLAINT

The State of Oklahoma, *ex rel.* the Oklahoma State Board of Medical Licensure and Supervision (the "Board"), alleges and states as follows for its Complaint against Jerome Edward Block, M.D. ("Defendant"), states and alleges as follows:

- 1. The Board is a duly authorized agency of the State of Oklahoma empowered to license and oversee the activities of physicians and surgeons in the State of Oklahoma pursuant to 59 Okla. Stat. § 480 *et seq.*
- 2. Defendant, Jerome Edward Block, M.D., holds Oklahoma medical license no. 22665. The acts and omissions complained of herein were made while Defendant was acting as a physician pursuant to his medical license conferred upon him by the State of Oklahoma. Such acts and omissions occurred within the physical territory of the State of Oklahoma.

Allegations of Unprofessional Conduct

- 3. This matter originated on May 17, 2013 with Patient BC filing an online complaint alleging the Defendant violated the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act ("HIPAA") by bringing an unknown patient into the exam room with Patient BC to speak with her about her own personal experience with hormone replacement.
- 4. On July 2, 2013, Investigator JL traveled to the Defendant's office to conduct an interview. The Defendant admitted he should have asked for permission to bring another patient into the exam room.

- 5. On August 9, 2013, DEA Agent BH called Investigator JL and advised the Defendant admitted to having his staff inject him with testosterone.
- 6. On November 22, 2013, Investigator JL and Investigator SW travelled to the Defendant's clinic. A copy of the injection log provided to DEA BH was provided to Investigators. Upon review of the log, it was found to list twelve (12) different injections being given to the Defendant by his staff as follows:

No	Date	Recipient	Testosterone (cc)	B-12 (cc)	Administered by
1	10/23/2012	JE Block	1.5	0.5	AR
2	11/7/2012	JE Block	1	1	AR
3	12/27/2012	Block	2	-	AR
4	1/22/2013	Block	1.5	1	AR
5	2/8/2013	Block	1.5	-	AR
6	3/12/2013	Block	1	1	AR
7	3/29/2013	Block	1	-	AR
8	4/15/2013	Block	1	-	AR
9	6/11/2013	Dr. J Block	1.5	1	LB
10	7/5/2013	Block J	1	1	AR
11	7/30/2013	Dr. JE Block	1	1	JG
12	8/13/2013	Block	0.75	-	AR
	10 months	·	14.75	6.5	12 injections

7. Upon review of the prescribing record of BB, the Defendant's wife, it was found that Defendant prescribed his wife phentermine on two (2) or more occasions. The prescribing record also showed that the Defendant's PA, PA Palmore, has written CDS to Defendant's wife ten (10) times with the last prescription being written on November 15, 2013. The Defendant did not recall authorizing the phentermine prescriptions BB had received which are as follows:

WRITTEN/FILLED	DRUG	STRENGTH	QTY	PHARMACY	Provider
11/12/2012	Phentermine	37.5	30	Dr. Block's Clinic	JE BLOCK, MD
12/20/2012	Phentermine	37.5	30	Dr. Block's Clinic	JE BLOCK, MD
2/11/2013	Phentermine	37.5	30	Dr. Block's Clinic	PA Palmore
4/10/2013	Phentermine	37.5	30	Dr. Block's Clinic	PA Palmore
5/24/2013	Phentermine	37.5	30	Dr. Block's Clinic	PA Palmore
7/3/2013	Phentermine	37.5	30	Dr. Block's Clinic	PA Palmore

- BB's prescribing record also shows she received six (6) CDS prescriptions in addition to the phentermine prescriptions. The Defendant did not recall prescribing the CDS for BB. BB's medical chart is devoid of any notation where the Defendant prescribed the CDS to BB.
- 9. On December 20, 2013, an employee of the Defendant's, AR, stated PA Palmore never authorized phentermine for Defendant's wife. AR advised the Defendant had authorized the prescriptions, but she was told by "administration" to "put it under the name of whatever other provider was there at the time."
- 10. On that same day another employee, DW, was interviewed. DW advised DW called in three (3) CDS (one dated 10/09/2013 and two dated 11/15/2013) for BB under Defendant's authorization. DW did not prescribe the pharmacy with the prescriber's name, so DW assumes the pharmacy entered them under the name of PA Palmore. DW stated again that PA Palmore did not authorize these prescriptions to BB, the Defendant did.
- 11. PA Palmore was then interviewed. He advised he "did not recall" prescribing or authorizing any CDS or non-CDS to BB. He stated he "doesn't recall" the Defendant ever telling him to prescribe CDS to BB, and, if prescriptions were called in for her under his name, PA Palmore was unaware of it.

WRITTEN/FILLED	DRUG	STRENGTH	QTY	PHARMACY	HOW RX GENERATED?
4/1/2013	Unk-Ketamine Compound		54	CareFirst	Compound Rx & Fax form (appears it was called in by PA John Palmore)
8/30/2013	Unk-EI(3)35,T9 Compound		1.05	CareFirst	Called in by PA Palmore
9/5/2013	Zolpidem Compound	10	13.5	CareFirst	Called in by PA Palmore
10/9/2013	Unk-El(3)35,T9 Compound		1.05	CareFirst	Called in by Employee DW
11/15/2013	Unk-El(3)35,T9 Compound		0.29	CareFirst	Called in by Employee DW
11/15/2013	Zolpidem Compound	10	13.5	CareFirst	Called in by Employee DW

- 12. Finally SF, Operations Manager of the Defendant's clinic, was interviewed. SF provided Investigator JL a memo he prepared dated December 20, 2013, wherein he states that "Dr. Block had engaged in self-treatment and prescribed medication to his wife in the past, but they are now under the care of Paul Howard, M.D."
- 13. The Defendant is guilty of unprofessional conduct in that he engaged in:
 - a) Dishonorable or immoral conduct which is likely to deceive, defraud, or harm the public in violation of Title 59 O.S. 2011 § 509(8);
 - b) Failure to maintain an office record for each patient which accurately reflects the evaluation, treatment, and medical necessity of treatment of the patient in violation of Title 59 O.S. 2011 § 509(18);
 - c) Purchasing or prescribing any regulated substance in Schedule I through V, as defined by the Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Act, for the physician's personal use in violation of Oklahoma Administrative Code Section 435:10-7-4(5);
 - d) Conduct likely to deceive, defraud, or harm the public in violation of Oklahoma Administrative Code Section 435:10-7-4(11);

- e) Willfully or negligently violating the confidentiality between physician and patient to the detriment of a patient except as required by law in violation of Oklahoma Administrative Code Section 435:10-7-4(14);
- f) Prescribing, selling, administering, distributing, ordering, or giving any drug legally classified as a controlled substance or recognized as an addictive dangerous drug to a family member or to himself or herself in violation of Oklahoma Administrative Code Section 435:10-7-4(26); and
- g) Violating state or federal law or regulation relating to controlled substances in violation of Oklahoma Administrative Code Section 435:10-7-4(27).

Conclusion

Given the foregoing, the undersigned requests that a hearing be conducted and upon proof of the allegations contained herein, impose such disciplinary action as authorized by law, up to and including suspension or revocation and any other appropriate action with respect to Defendant's medical license, and an assessment of costs and attorney's fees incurred in this action as provided by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason T. Seay, OBA No. 22007 Assistant Attorney General General Counsel Section 313 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Mailing Address: 101 N.E. 51st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105 Phone: (405) 962-1400 Fax: (405) 962-1499

Attorney for State of Oklahoma ex rel. The Oklahoma State Board of Medical Licensure and Supervision