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

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel,)			
OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF)			
MEDICAL LICENSURE AND)			
SUPERVISION,)			
)			
Plaintiff,)			
V •)			
)			
GEORGE MARKERT, M.D.)	CASE	NO.	88-1-559
Medical License No. 7600,)			
)			
Defendant.)			

AMENDED COMPLAINT

COMES NOW Charles Morton, Investigator for the Oklahoma State Board of Medical Licensure and Supervision, being first duly sworn upon oath and states:

- 1. That George Markert, M.D., holding Oklahoma Medical License No. 7600, is in violation of the Oklahoma Medical Practice Act, 59 O.S. 1981, Sec. 509, Paragraph 17, to-wit:
 - "17. Prescribing, dispensing or administering of controlled substances or narcotic drugs in excess of the amount considered good medical practice, or prescribing, dispensing or administering controlled substances or narcotic drugs without medical need in accordance with published standards."
- 2. That George Markert, M.D., is in violation of the Rules and Regulations promulgated by this Board, specifically Section IX, Rules 1, 2, and 6, to-wit:
 - "Rule 1: Indiscriminate or excessive prescribing, dispensing or administering of controlled or narcotic drugs."
 - "Rule 2: Prescribing, dispensing or administering of controlled or narcotic drugs in excess of the amount considered good medical practice."
 - "Rule 6: Dispensing, prescribing or administering a controlled substance or narcotic drug without medical need."
- 3. That from approximately May 1, 1988, to September 20, 1988, the Defendant wrote a total of approximately 1,102 prescriptions for Scheduled drugs in a total number of dosage units of 64,452, plus 28 additional prescriptions for 5,312 dosage units in other forms.

- 4. That a prescription survey conducted in reference to certain Scheduled drugs reveals that patient E.B. received approximately 10 prescriptions for 1,000 dosage units of controlled dangerous substances from May 27, 1988, through September 6, 1988, for an average of 9.71 dosage units per day.
- 5. That a prescription survey conducted in reference to certain Scheduled drugs reveals that patient R.M. received approximately 14 prescriptions for 894 dosage units of controlled dangerous substances from May 16, 1988, through July 7, 1988, for an average of 8.94 dosage units per day.
- 6. That a prescription survey conducted in reference to certain Scheduled drugs reveals that patient W.A. received approximately 13 prescriptions for 1,100 dosage units of controlled dangerous substances from May 4, 1988, through September 7, 1988, for an average of 8.66 dosage units per day.
- 7. That a prescription survey conducted in reference to certain Scheduled drugs reveals that patient B.B. received approximately 12 prescriptions for 1,150 dosage units of controlled dangerous substances from May 7, 1988, through September 16, 1988, for an average of 8.65 dosage units per day.
- 8. That a prescription survey conducted in reference to certain Scheduled drugs reveals that patient K.T. received approximately 7 prescriptions for 1,400 dosage units of controlled dangerous substances from May 21, 1988, through September 15, 1988, for an average of 8.47 dosage units per day.
- 9. That all of the above, in addition to other patient records reveal that Scheduled drugs were being prescribed by the Defendant in excess of the amount considered for the medical need presented.
- 10. That a prescription survey conducted in reference to certain Scheduled drugs reveals that patient G.W. received 1,880 dosage units of Percodan and Valium during the period of January 1, 1988, to December 12, 1988, for an average of 5.3 dosage units per day, and patient L.W. received a total of 2,640 dosage units of Percodan and Valium during the period of

January 1, 1988, to December 12, 1988, for an average of 7.5 dosage units per day.

11. That on or around January 6, 1989, Defendant failed to produce patient records of patients G.W. and L.W. when same were lawfully subpoensed by an investigator of the Board.

WHEREFORE, Complainant prays this Board to conduct a hearing and upon proof of the allegations contained herein that such disciplinary action be taken by the Board as is authorized by law.

CHARLES MORTON, Investigator State Board of Medical Licensure and Supervision

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 25 day of ganuary, 1989.

Notary Public

My Commission expires:

.