# STATE BOARD OF DENTISTRY AGENDA

Will meet on Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

# \*TO BE HELD THROUGH VIDEO AND AUDIO CONFERENCING\* IN ORDER TO JOIN THE MEETING PARTIES WILL LOGIN TO:

https://IndianaEnhanced.Webex.com/join/PLAWebex OR
BY TELEPHONE BY CALLING 1-240-454-0887. MEETING PARTICIPANTS CALLING THE
TELEPHONE NUMBER MUST ENTER THE MEETING ACCESS CODE 610.915.440 TO JOIN
THE MEETING

# I. CALL TO ORDER AND ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

9:00 a.m.

Dr. Mara Catey-Williams called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. through virtual video and audio conferencing. Dr. Mara Catey-Williams declared a quorum in accordance with Indiana Code § 15-5-1.1-6(c).

# **Board Members Present:**

Mara Catey-Williams, D.M.D., President Richard R. Nowakowski, D.D.S., Vice President Jeffrey L. Snoddy, D.D.S. Gregory A. Berger, D.D.S. Annette J. Williamson, D.D.S. Jennifer K. Bartek, L.D.H., M.S., C.D.A. R. Daron Sheline, D.D.S. Ted M. Reese, D.D.S., Secretary/Designee Mark R. Stetzel, D.D.S. Robert D. Findley, D.D.S.

# **Board Members Not Present:**

Consumer Member, Vacant

# **State Officials Present:**

Cindy Vaught, Board Director, Professional Licensing Agency Dana Brooks, Assistant Board Director, Professional Licensing Agency Felicia Wise, Litigation Specialist, Professional Licensing Agency Claire Dyer, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

# II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

As this is the first time a virtual video and audio conference has been called for the State Board of Dentistry, a motion was made and seconded to implement a roll call of the board members when casting their vote.

CATEY-WILLIAMS/NOWAKOWSKI Motion carried 10-0-0

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the agenda.

CATEY-WILLIAMS/NOWAKOWSKI Motion carried 10-0-0

#### III. ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

9:00 a.m.

### A. Mathew Negrelli, D.D.S., License No. 12009878A

Administrative Cause No. 2019 ISBD 0005 Re: Summary Suspension Extension

#### **Parties Present:**

Respondent was not present Alyssa Servies, Deputy Attorney General for the State of Indiana Sherri Rutledge, Court Reporter, Rutledge Independent Reporting

# **Participating Board Members:**

Dr. Catey-Williams, DMD (Hearing Officer)

Dr. Nowakowski, DDS

Dr. Stetzel, DDS

Dr. Sheline, DDS

Dr. Williamson, DDS

Dr. Findley, DDS

Dr. Reese, DDS

Dr. Berger, DDS

Dr. Snoddy, DDS

Ms. Bartek, MS, CDA, LDH

Case Summary: On or around February 7, 2020 the Board granted a motion to extend the Suspension of the Respondent's Dental license for 90 days for public health and safety concerns. The Board submitted notices to Respondent to appear regarding the extension of his suspension and has not received a response. It is understood by the State that Respondent has allowed work to resume at his practice despite Governor Holcomb's order to only practice if the case is an emergency and the office staff must wear PPE. Respondent is currently not enrolled in a wellbeing program. As the Board does not have further inquiries with the State, and it was understood final action cannot take place at this time since Respondent did appear at February meeting. Proceedings were then closed.

**Board action:** A motion was made and seconded to extend the 90 day suspension of Dr. Negrelli's license.

NOWAKOWSKI/FINDLEY Motion carried 10-0-0

# B. William J. Downie, D.D.S., License No. 12011611A

Administrative Cause No. 2020 ISBD 0002 Re: Summary Suspension Extension

#### **Parties Present:**

Respondent was present with no counsel Alyssa Servies, Deputy Attorney General for the State of Indiana Sherri Rutledge, Court Reporter, Rutledge Independent Reporting

# **Participating Board Members:**

Dr. Catey-Williams, DMD (Hearing Officer)

Dr. Nowakowski, DDS

Dr. Sheline, DDS

Dr. Williamson, DDS

Dr. Findley, DDS

Dr. Reese, DDS

Dr. Berger, DDS

Dr. Snoddy, DDS

Ms. Bartek, MS, CDA, LDH

#### **Recused Board Members:**

Dr. Stetzel, DDS

Case Summary: On February 7, 2020 the State presented evidence and witnesses to show that Respondent was a clear and present danger by not displaying the minimum of standard of care. Respondent opened case by stating that he was not a clear and present danger in his practice, and to request the removal of the suspension on his license. Respondent stated that while he has made errors in his practice, those errors were due to financial difficulties. Those difficulties made it hard for him to acquire appropriate support staff for his practice. Respondent informed the State that his current practice in Fort Wayne closed in February due to those financial reasons. The State inquired on how many patients he saw in February prior to his practice closing. Respondent informed the State that he did not know the exact number of patients he saw. He let the State know that he currently only has paper records as he could no longer afford electronic record keeping. As the Respondent is not currently in office he cannot access those records to give the State an estimate. The State inquired if he knew how many patients have left his practice in the past 2 (two) years. The Respondent was not sure since he did not have access to his records. The State asked if he had ever provided a copy of patient records upon their request. He responded that he has provided those records, however sometimes there might have been a delay due to poor record keeping. He informed the State that his charging fees were in line with the recommended guidelines the IDA (Indiana Dental Association) recommends. The State inquired how current patients get ahold of him for contact information. Respondent provided an email address that patients can contact him with. Respondent did inform that State that he has had patients complain about lack of contact, but that this difficulty was due to the fact he had to change office software programs constantly due to financial constraints. Those constant program changes caused his contact information to change to reflect the new program. Respondent inform the State that he did hire a financial manager to assist him, however, the financial manager had poor skills and provided him with bad advice. He informed the State that he has filed bankruptcy twice since 2018 and both times it has been dismissed. When the State inquired into incident with Patient 1, Respondent said that patient did not complain clearly to him and that the procedure he attempted was not successful. Respondent informed the State that he had tried to contact 2 (two) oral surgeons for help on the procedure, however they could not help. The State inquired if he shared the details of the issue with the oral surgeons, and Respondent replied that he only informed them he had an issue with no firm details. The State asked about incident with Patient 2 and Respondent said that incident was due to the financial issues occurring at the time. The State asked for clarity on that as Exhibit M fell out of the mouth of Patient 2. Respondent was not able to clarify. The State asked Respondent if he is aware of how many complaints have been filed against him. Respondent informed the State that no he is not aware of the exact tally, however he does have documents from the Attorney General's Office of all correspondence on those issues. He also informed the State that he is aware of 3(three) or 4 (four) IDA complaints. He informed the State that currently his malpractice insurance has lapsed. The lapse occurred at the same time his license was initially suspended a few months back. He informed the State that some of his patients have filed small claims suits against him

as well. When the State inquired why Respondent has not participated in proceedings with his license prior to today, he informed the State it was due to poor management and financial hardship. Respondent informed the State that while his skill are not the best and he has made mistakes with his practice, this does not mean that his is providing substandard care for his patients. He informed the State that he and his father are both dentists at the practice, and that he has 2 dental hygienists on staff with no dental assistants. Respondent informed the State that his normal hours of care are from 9am-5pm, however he changed his hours to 12pm-8pm to better accommodate his patients. He informed the State that he practices normal dentistry, restorative care, oral care, endodontics care, and prosthetics care. A normal surgery at his office would average around 1.5 hours. He uses lidocaine and local anesthetic. If a patient goes to anther dentists and patient records are requested he tries his best to provide those patient records for the dentist. Recent times providing those records has been difficult since most of his current records are paper. For a time he did have electronic records, however due to inability to pay the bills for that system he has lost access to those records a few months back. As the State had no further inquiries Respondent concluded that he is sorry that his patients feel that he has done them a disservice. He is sorry that his financial difficulties and level of care have caused issues, however he does not believe they are reasons to show lack of care for his patients and warrant a suspension. The State recommends that the extension of the 90 day suspension for the Respondent is warranted due to substandard care. The State does feel that the Respondent does present a clear and present danger. The State states that the Respondent does not show that there would be an improvement of patient care should he resume practice and that the care received by his patients will not be different than what has been presented. The proceedings are now concluded.

**Board action:** A motion was made and seconded to extend the 90 day suspension of Dr. Downie's license.

CATEY-WILLIAMS/NOWAKOWSKI Motion carried 9-0-1 \*STETZEL recused.

# IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, and having completed its duties, the meeting of the State Board of Dentistry adjourned at 10:03am by general consensus.

# **Next Scheduled Meeting:**

Friday, June 5, 2020 Indiana Government Center South 402 West Washington Street, Room W064 Indianapolis, Indiana