

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD**

2 In the Matter of

Case No. MD-17-0873A

3 **DAVID K. TOM, M.D.**

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS  
OF LAW AND ORDER FOR LETTER  
OF REPRIMAND AND PROBATION**

4 Holder of License No. 43118  
5 For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine  
6 In the State of Arizona.

7 The Arizona Medical Board (“Board”) considered this matter at its public meeting on  
8 February 7, 2020. David K. Tom, M.D. (“Respondent”), appeared with legal counsel,  
9 Fredrick M. Cummings, Esq., before the Board for a Formal Interview pursuant to the  
10 authority vested in the Board by A.R.S. § 32-1451(H). The Board voted to issue Findings  
11 of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order for Letter of Reprimand and Probation after due  
12 consideration of the facts and law applicable to this matter.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

13 1. The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of  
14 the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.

15 2. Respondent is the holder of license number 43118 for the practice of  
16 allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.

17 3. The Board initiated case number MD-17-0873A after receiving a complaint  
18 regarding Respondent’s care and treatment of a 35 year-old female patient (“TH”) alleging  
19 failure to properly perform cervical spine epidural injection.

20 4. TH established care with a Pain Management Practice in March, 2017. TH  
21 received cervical medial branch nerve blocks (MBB) and radiofrequency ablation (RFA)  
22 from practitioners at the Pain Management Practice without relief. A cervical MRI from  
23 March 6, 2017, showed early degenerative changes of cervical spine without significant  
24 canal or foraminal stenosis.  
25

1           5.     On July 18, 2017, TH presented to a Pain Management Practice and saw a  
2 nurse practitioner (NP) for complaints of severe neck pain and headaches. The NP  
3 diagnosed TH with cervical myelopathy, chronic headache, cervicalgia, and muscle pain.  
4 The NP's plan was for TH to receive a cervical epidural steroid injection (CESI) for cervical  
5 radiculopathy.

6           6.     On July 22, 2017, Respondent performed a CESI at the C6-C7. Per the  
7 anesthesia record TH received Versed 4mg, Fentanyl 100mcg, and Propofol 230mg. TH  
8 complained post-procedure of right upper extremity pain, headache, and decreased  
9 sensation of her left upper extremity. Emergency services were called to transport TH to  
10 Hospital. An MRI of the cervical spine performed at the Hospital showed T2 hypointense  
11 signal extending along the left aspect of the cervical spinal cord starting at approximately  
12 level the C2-C3 disc space superiorly and extending inferiorly to at least the level of the  
13 C7-T1 disc space. The findings were noted to be highly worrisome for intramedullary blood  
14 tracking superiorly and inferiorly within the left aspect of the cervical spinal cord.  
15 Neurosurgery evaluated the patient and decided not to evacuate the hematoma.

16           7.     On July 30, 2017, TH was discharged from the Hospital with the diagnoses  
17 of intramedullary C2-C7 hematoma from epidural injection and left-sided hemiparesis.

18           8.     The standard of care requires a physician to have adequate medical  
19 indication prior to proceeding with a high-risk intervention. Respondent deviated from this  
20 standard of care by performing a CESI procedure without adequate medical indication.

21           9.     The standard of care requires a physician to utilize appropriate anesthesia  
22 based on the procedure being performed. Respondent deviated from the standard of care  
23 by utilizing inappropriate anesthesia with high dose Propofol for a CESI procedure.

24           10.    Actual patient harm was identified in that the patient had cervical spinal cord  
25 injury with intramedullary hematoma.

1           11.    There was the potential for patient harm in that the patient was at risk for  
2 nerve damage, increase in pain, sensory and motor function loss

3           12.    During a Formal Interview on this matter, Respondent testified regarding the  
4 technique used during the procedure performed on TH. Respondent stated that during the  
5 procedure, he did not feel that he went past the dura into the patient's spinal cord.  
6 Respondent also testified regarding the loss of the images taken during the procedure.  
7 Respondent stated that he has changed his practice and no longer relies on x-ray  
8 technicians to save images taken during procedures, and now directs technicians to save  
9 specific images. With regard to his operative note, Respondent stated that his general  
10 practice is to utilize a template, and to then complete the note after the procedure is over  
11 and the patient is discharged. In this case, Respondent stated that he failed to complete  
12 the note due to the confusion surrounding TH's injury.

13           13.    Respondent testified that with regard to the choice to use Propofol,  
14 Respondent stated that he wanted to utilize a combination of fentanyl and Versed;  
15 however, TH requested Propofol due to medication tolerance issues. Respondent stated  
16 that although he felt that his clinical judgment was appropriate, he would not make the  
17 same choice with a similar presentation for a future patient.

18           14.    During that same Formal Interview, Board members discussed Respondent's  
19 care and treatment of TH. Board members expressed concern with regard to the  
20 vagueness inherent in Respondent's treatment and medical recordkeeping. Additionally,  
21 when discussing whether the matter rose to the level of discipline, Board members  
22 expressed concern regarding Respondent's apparent lack of ownership for the  
23 complication that occurred during TH's procedure. Board members agreed that continuing  
24 education in both medical recordkeeping and cervical spine pain procedures would assist  
25 the Respondent in remediating his practice.

1 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

2 1. The Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof and over  
3 Respondent.

4 2. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional  
5 conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(e) ("Failing or refusing to maintain adequate  
6 records on a patient.").

7 3. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional  
8 conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(r) ("Committing any conduct or practice that is  
9 or might be harmful or dangerous to the health of the patient or the public.").

10 **ORDER**

11 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

12 1. Respondent is issued a Letter of Reprimand.

13 2. Respondent is placed on Probation for a period of six months with the following  
14 terms and conditions:

15 a. **Continuing Medical Education**

16 Respondent shall within 6 months of the effective date of this Order obtain no less  
17 than 10 hours of Board Staff pre-approved Category I Continuing Medical Education  
18 ("CME") in an intensive, in-person course regarding medical recordkeeping and no less  
19 than 5 hours of Category I CME in cervical spine pain procedures. Respondent shall  
20 within **thirty days** of the effective date of this Order submit his request for CME to the  
21 Board for pre-approval. Upon completion of the CME, Respondent shall provide Board  
22 staff with satisfactory proof of attendance. The CME hours shall be in addition to the hours  
23 required for the biennial renewal of medical licensure. The Probation shall terminate upon  
24 Respondent's proof of successful completion of the CME.

25



1 ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed  
2 this 8<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2020 with:

3 Arizona Medical Board  
4 1740 West Adams, Suite 4000  
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

6   
7 Board staff

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25