

1 **BEFORE THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD**

2 In the Matter of
3 **LEE S. YOSOWITZ, M.D.**
4 Holder of License No. 12610
5 For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine
6 In the State of Arizona.

Case No. MD-20-0660A, MD-20-1055A

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

7 The Review Committee of the Arizona Medical Board (“Board”) considered this
8 matter at its public meeting on October 25, 2021. Lee S. Yosowitz, M.D. (“Respondent”),
9 appeared with legal counsel, Steve Myers, Esq., before the Review Committee for a
10 Formal Interview pursuant to the authority vested in the Board by A.R.S. § 32-1451(P).
11 The Review Committee voted to issue Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order for
12 Letter of Reprimand and Probation after due consideration of the facts and law applicable
13 to this matter.

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

16 2. Respondent is the holder of license number 12610 for the practice of
17 allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.

MD-20-0660A

18
19 3. The Board initiated case number after receiving notification that a Hospital
20 where Respondent held privileges revoked Respondent’s privileges to perform forceps-
21 assisted deliveries. Respondent subsequently voluntarily resigned his clinical privileges at
22 the Hospital. Based on the complaint, Board staff requested Medical Consultant (“MC”)
23 review of three patient charts.

24 4. MR was a 34 year-old gravida 6 para 4 patient who was admitted to the
25 Hospital on November 6, 2019 at term with ruptured membranes. MR progressed after an

1 epidural. During the second stage of labor, fetal heart rate ("FHR") decelerations were
2 noted. When decelerations became severe and the patient was noted to be crowning,
3 Respondent elected to use forceps to expedite the delivery. Leukhart-Simpson forceps
4 were used with the infant in the left occiput anterior ("LOA") position, the forceps slipped
5 off and required replacement to complete the delivery. A tight nuchal cord was reduced on
6 the perineum.

7 5. The infant ("JS") had Apgar scores of 7 and 9 and weighed 8 pounds 8
8 ounces with arterial blood gasses ("ABG") of 7.303. In the nursery, JS was noted to have
9 facial bruising and had swelling in his right upper eyelid, which would not open
10 spontaneously. JS's pupils were noted to be unequal, with the right pupil measuring 8mm
11 while the left was 3mm. No visible hemorrhage of the right eye was present and neither
12 pupil had any obvious reaction to light. An intracranial ultrasound was normal and a
13 pediatric ophthalmologist assessed the infant. One month later, a diagnosis of right
14 oculomotor nerve palsy was made after an MRI showed a subdural hematoma pressing on
15 the third cranial nerve.

16 6. AC was a 26 year-old gravita 4 para 2 patient who was seen at the Hospital
17 on November 10, 2018, to check her HCG level after being treated with Methotrexate
18 ("MTX") for an ectopic pregnancy three days prior. Respondent was called and indicated to
19 the nursing staff that he would be coming in 20 minutes. Over an hour later, he was called
20 again and stated that he'd seen the patient, but the patient stated he had not been in to
21 see her. Respondent arrived three hours after the initial call and reportedly saw the patient
22 but did not evaluate her and did not document the interaction. The MC commented that
23 there was no patient harm, but noted that his behavior was unprofessional, which was
24 acknowledged by Respondent during the course of the Board's investigation. Respondent
25 reported that he had changed his care to avoid a similar event in the future.

1 7. SC was a 29 year-old gravita 4 para 2 patient with a history of a previous C-
2 section, who presented in labor at term on June 7, 2019. A repeat C-section was
3 performed with delivery at 0850 of an 8'1" infant and a 1200cc blood loss noted.

4 8. SC developed uterine atony in the PACU and Respondent was called and
5 responded telephonically, initially ordering Pitocin to be increased and then adding Cytotec
6 at 1054, which reportedly helped. At 1145, Respondent ordered Methergine in addition to
7 other medications for ongoing bleeding.

8 9. By 1154, a decision was made to take SC to surgery due to an inadequate
9 response to the medications and two units of PRBCs were administered. Respondent
10 arrived at 1146. The procedure was carried out under IV sedation and included a curettage
11 and placement of a Bakri balloon, which was partially inflated in the OR. A total of 2650 cc
12 of blood loss (including the 1200 from the C-section) was calculated after the second
13 procedure. The Bakri balloon was further filled when bleeding continued post-operatively
14 and a total loss of 3235 cc was calculated overall. Hemabate was given in the PACU. Two
15 days after the procedures, the patient was stable with an H&H of 7.7/22.8. The MC noted
16 that Respondent failed to document details regarding blood transfusions or medications
17 administered during the procedure.

18 10. The standard of care requires a physician to properly place the forceps when
19 performing a forceps-assisted delivery. Respondent deviated from this standard of care by
20 improperly placing forceps when performing a forceps-assisted delivery for MR and JS.

21 11. The standard of care requires a physician to evaluate a patient with post-
22 partum hemorrhage to determine the cause of the problem. Respondent deviated from the
23 standard of care by failing to timely evaluate Patient SC's post-partum hemorrhage
24 requiring medical and surgical intervention.

25

1 12. Actual patient harm was identified in that Patient JS experienced anisocoria
2 and SC's treatment of her post-partum hemorrhage was delayed.

3 13. There was the potential for patient harm in that JS was at risk of additional
4 injury due to the improperly placed forceps. SC was at risk of additional surgical
5 intervention and maternal death.

6 **MD-20-1055A**

7 14. The Board initiated case number MD-20-1055A after receiving a complaint
8 regarding Respondent's care and treatment of a 36 year-old female patient ("AB") alleging
9 inappropriate care and treatment, inappropriate performance of a C-section, and failure to
10 transfer care to a urologist.

11 15. AB, a gravida 5 para 3 pregnant female at 38 weeks presented to a different
12 Hospital where Respondent held privileges on November 4, 2020 complaining of leaking
13 fluid for 30 minutes. AB's problem list included polyhydramnios possible macrosomia. AB's
14 cervical exam showed she was dilated at 4cm. The fetal heart rate (FHR) was a category
15 2.

16 16. At 1850, AB's cervical exam showed she was dilated at 7cm with FHA at
17 category 2 with indeterminate tracing. Respondent recommended a C-section at 2144,
18 and noted that AB requested more time to decide.

19 17. At 2331, Respondent performed the C-section. During the procedure,
20 Respondent noted that the foley catheter and bulb had penetrated a portion of AB's
21 bladder dome that had been adherent to the lower uterine segment, and were located in
22 the peritoneal cavity. Respondent documented repair via Alice clamps and three layer
23 closure.

24 18. On November 5, 2020, a urology consult was obtained due to the bladder
25 laceration associated with the C-section. A CT urogram showed persistent focal 7.8 mm

1 perforation site associated with right anterior bladder. Associated mild extravasation of
2 contrast from the bladder adjacent to the drainage catheter was also identified.

3 19. On November 17, 2020, AB was seen by urology for irritable bladder
4 symptoms. AB was evaluated with cystoscopy and required lysis of two adhesions within
5 the bladder anterior and posterior walls.

6 20. The Board's MC reviewed the case and found that Respondent met the
7 standard of care. However, the MC opined that Respondent's documentation lacked a
8 detailed description of the bladder injury or an intraoperative urology consultation. The MC
9 also noted that there was little or no documentation of addressing FHR concerns. The MC
10 opined that better documentation could have improved communication with urologist and
11 reassured the patient.

12 **Formal Interview**

13 21. During a Formal Interview on this matter, Respondent testified regarding his
14 care and treatment of the patients at issue. With regard to the descriptions in the
15 operative report for Patient AB, Respondent testified that he believed his documentation
16 was adequate. With regard to Patient AC, Respondent testified that he was not required
17 to talk to the Patient; but rather, only to be present face to face, to make certain that she
18 had been provided with the appropriate information that there were no problems.
19 Respondent testified that he did speak with the nurse. Respondent testified regarding his
20 belief that he practiced within the standard of care for each case reviewed.

21 22. During that same Formal Interview, Review Committee members discussed
22 the case findings and whether the matter rose to the level of discipline. Committee
23 members commented that Respondent did not appear to have been sufficiently available
24 to his patients, and expressed concern regarding Respondent's continued assertions that
25

1 he met the standard of care. The Committee agreed that the case rose to the level of
2 discipline and agreed that continuing medical education was warranted.

3 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

4 1. The Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof and over
5 Respondent.

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

9 3. The conduct and circumstances described in MD-20-0660A constitutes
10 unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(r) ("Committing any conduct or
11 practice that is or might be harmful or dangerous to the health of the patient or the
12 public.").

13 **ORDER**

14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 15 1. Respondent is issued a Letter of Reprimand.
16 2. Respondent is placed on Probation for a period of six months with the following
17 terms and conditions:

18 a. **Continuing Medical Education**

19 Respondent shall within 6 months of the date of this Order, complete the Improving Inter-
20 Professional Communication Course offered by the Center for Personalized Education for
21 Professionals ("CPEP"). Respondent shall within **thirty days** of the effective date of this
22 Order submit satisfactory proof of enrollment with Board staff. Upon completion of the
23 CME, Respondent shall provide Board staff with satisfactory proof of attendance. The
24 CME hours shall be in addition to the hours required for the biennial renewal of medical
25

1 licensure. The Probation shall terminate upon Respondent's proof of successful
2 completion of the CME.

3 **b. Obey All Laws**

4 Respondent shall obey all state, federal and local laws, all rules governing the
5 practice of medicine in Arizona, and remain in full compliance with any court ordered
6 criminal probation, payments and other orders.

7 **RIGHT TO PETITION FOR REHEARING OR REVIEW**

8 Respondent is hereby notified that he has the right to petition for a rehearing or
9 review. The petition for rehearing or review must be filed with the Board's Executive
10 Director within thirty (30) days after service of this Order. A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(B). The
11 petition for rehearing or review must set forth legally sufficient reasons for granting a
12 rehearing or review. A.A.C. R4-16-103. Service of this order is effective five (5) days after
13 date of mailing. A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(C). If a petition for rehearing or review is not filed,
14 the Board's Order becomes effective thirty-five (35) days after it is mailed to Respondent.

15 Respondent is further notified that the filing of a motion for rehearing or review is
16 required to preserve any rights of appeal to the Superior Court.

17 DATED AND EFFECTIVE this 15th day of December, 2021.

18 ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

19
20 By Patricia E. McSorley
21 Patricia E. McSorley
22 Executive Director
23
24
25

1 EXECUTED COPY of the foregoing mailed
this 1st day of December, 2021 to:

2

3 Stephen Myers, Esq.
4 Mitchell Stein Carey Chapman, PC
5 2 North Central Avenue #1450
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
7 Attorney for Respondent

6

7 ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed
this 1st day of December, 2021 with:

8

9 Arizona Medical Board
10 1740 West Adams, Suite 4000
11 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

10

11



12

Board staff

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25