3

4 5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BEFORE THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

In the Matter of

MURALI D. TALLURI, M.D.

Holder of License No. 19237 For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine In the State of Arizona. Case Nos. MD-18-0958A, MD-18-1013A, MD-19-0047 and MD-19-0238A

ORDER FOR DECREE OF CENSURE AND PROBATION WITH PRACTICE RESTRICTION; AND CONSENT TO THE SAME

Murali D. Talluri, M.D. ("Respondent") elects to permanently waive any right to a hearing and appeal with respect to this Order for Decree of Censure and Probation with Practice Restriction; admits the jurisdiction of the Arizona Medical Board ("Board"); and consents to the entry of this Order by the Board.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 2. Respondent is the holder of license number 19237 for the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 3. The Board initiated case numbers MD-18-0958A, MD-18-1013A, MD-19-0047 and MD-19-0238A pursuant to the Board's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order for Letter of Reprimand, Civil Penalty and Probation issued in cases MD-15-1390A and MD-16-0479A ("Order"), which required Respondent to enter into a contract with a Board-approved monitoring company to perform periodic chart reviews in order to monitor Respondent's care and treatment of patients after his completion of Board-approved intensive in-person continuing medical education ("CME") in opioid prescribing, as well as the Professional/Problem0Based Ethics ("ProBE") program offered by the Center for Personalized Education for Physicians ("CPEP") for ethics and boundaries. The required CME courses were completed in October, 2017 and Respondent entered into a contract for chart reviews on May 17, 2018.

- 4. In each of the cases referenced herein, the monitoring company found deficiencies in Respondent's documentation and/or identified patients for whom Respondent failed to meet generally accepted standards of practice.
- 5. Based on concerns raised during the monitoring company's reviews in these cases, Respondent entered into an Interim Consent Agreement for Practice Restriction, effective March 18, 2019. Board staff requested Medical Consultant ("MC") review to further address whether Respondent's treatment met the standard of care.

MD-18-0958A

6. An MC reviewed Respondent's care and treatment of Patients BA and KN. The MC determined that Respondent's medical record documentation was inconsistent and not appropriately updated on every visit, and that Respondent failed to document a discussion regarding lowering a medication prescribed to KN.

MD-18-1013A

7. An MC reviewed Respondent's care and treatment of Patients NB, DG and BE. With regard to Patient NB, the MC noted that the medication list was not updated with current and discontinued medications. With regard to Patient DG, the MC noted duplication of electronic documentation and incomplete risk assessment and discussion regarding narcotic use. With regard to Patient BE, the MC noted that Respondent did not fully address reported symptoms of memory loss, addictive behavior and inconsistent urine toxicology results.

MD-19-0047A

- 8. Two MCs reviewed Respondent's care and treatment of six patients for whom deficiencies were identified by the monitoring company.
- 9. LH was a 49 year-old female patient with a past medical history of back pain, right knee pain, chronic opioid use, and insomnia. Respondent prescribed LH medications

including oxycodone 30mg every 6 hours, gabapentin 300mg three times daily, and trazodone 100mg daily. An MRI of LH's knee showed a chronic ACL tear with degenerative changes and a lumbar MRI showed minimal changes.

- 10. SH was a 62 year-old female with a past medical history of opioid dependence, hypertension, anxiety, depression, and a history of breast cancer. Respondent prescribed SH medications including clonazepam 1mg twice daily, Prozac 80mg daily, Wellbutrin 300mg daily, Pristiq 25mg daily, and Suboxone 8mg daily.
- 11. AE was a 40 year-old male with a past history of alcoholism, hypogonadism, attention deficit disorder, anxiety, depression, and opioid dependence. Respondent prescribed AE medications including Suboxone 8mg three times daily, Adderall 20mg three times daily, Xanax 1mg twice daily, Zyprexa 10mg daily, and clonazepam 1mg three times daily.
- 12. RF was a 63 year-old male with a past medical history of diabetes, hypertension, hypogonadism, and opioid dependency. Respondent prescribed RF Suboxone 8mg daily.
- 13. PS was a 38 year-old male patient with a past medical history of opioid dependency. Respondent prescribed PS Subutex 8mg three times daily.
- 14. CD was a 65 year-old male patient with a past medical history of opioid dependence, hypertension, alcoholism, and hypogonadism. Respondent prescribed CD medications including Zubsolv 8.6/2.1mg three times daily, Cialis 5mg daily, Lisinopril 20mg daily, and clonidine 0.1mg daily.
- 15. The two MC's were critical of Respondent's failure to trial non-pharmacologic treatments prior to prescribing opioids for patient LH, and the first MC noted delays in the orthopedic evaluation of LH's knee pain and physical therapy evaluation for back pain. The second MC opined that Respondent's documentation for all five patients was inadequate,

noting with information appeared to be carried forward without review for accuracy, new medications were added without clinical indication or discussion, and different medication doses were identified in different parts of the notes.

- 16. The standard of care prohibits a physician from prescribing high dose opioids for non-malignant pain without justification. Respondent deviated from the standard of care for Patient LH by prescribing high dose opioids for non-malignant pain without justification.
- 17. Actual patient harm was identified in that LH experienced a delay in orthopedic evaluation of knee pain and physical therapy for back pain. There was potential for patient harm in that LH was at risk for complications of unnecessary opioid therapy.

MD-19-0238A

- 18. An MC reviewed Respondent's care and treatment of three patients for whom deficiencies were identified by the monitoring company.
- 19. MS was a 77 year-old female with a past medical history of Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, dystonia, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, spinal deformity, multiple falls, and chronic pain. Respondent began visiting MS at an assisted living facility ("ALF") on September 21, 2018 and continued to see MS on a weekly basis. MS required several adjustments in her blood pressure and pain medications with the assistance of a pain specialist.
- 20. NC was an 85 year-old female with a past medical history of Alzheimer's disease with memory loss, hypertension, hypothyroidism, macular degeneration, recent heart valve replacement, and dyspnea. Respondent prescribed NC medications including blood pressure medications, bronchial dilators, atorvastatin, meclizine, and aspirin.

Respondent began visiting NC at an ALF on January 1, 2018 and continued to see her on a weekly basis until April 2018 when Respondent began seeing NC monthly.

- 21. RF was a 66 year-old male with a past medical history of chemical dependence, hypertension, diabetes and hypogonadism. RF initiated care with Respondent on January 28, 2015. Respondent prescribed Suboxone 8mg and advised a follow up visit in 30 days. On October 21, 2016, Respondent initiated prescriptions of benzodiazepines to RF.
- 22. The MC determined that in all three cases, Respondent's documentation was inaccurate and inadequate. In the case of patient RF, the MC found that Respondent prescribed Suboxone and benzodiazepines concomitantly without a clinical rationale.
- 23. The standard of care prohibits a physician from prescribing opiates and benzodiazepines concomitantly without a clinical rationale. Respondent deviated from this standard of care by prescribing for RF Suboxone and benzodiazepines concomitantly without a clinical rationale.
- 24. There was the potential for patient harm in the case of patient RF in that minimal attention was paid to other problems.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- a. The Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof and over Respondent.
- b. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(e)("Failing or refusing to maintain adequate records on a patient.").
- c. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(r)("Committing any conduct or practice that is or might be harmful or dangerous to the health of the patient or the public.").

<u>ORDER</u>

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. Respondent is issued a Decree of Censure.
- 2. Respondent is placed on Probation for a period of 10 years with the following terms and conditions:

a. Practice Restriction

Respondent's practice is restricted in that the Respondent is prohibited from prescribing controlled substances until receiving permission from the Board to do so after completing the Continuing Medical Education ("CME") as stated in paragraph 2(b) of this Order, completed within six months of the date of request for termination is made; and, must be accompanied by proof of enrollment with a Board-approved monitoring company for chart reviews as stated in paragraph 2(c) of this Order. Respondent shall not request release from the Practice Restriction for five years from the effective date of this Order.

b. Continuing Medical Education

Within six months prior to the date of Respondent's request for termination of the Practice Restriction, Respondent shall complete no less than 15 hours of Board staff preapproved Category I Continuing Medical Education ("CME") in an intensive, in-person course regarding controlled substances prescribing. Prior to attending the CME course, Respondent shall submit his request for CME to the Board for pre-approval. Upon completion of the CME, Respondent shall provide Board staff with satisfactory proof of attendance. The CME hours shall be in addition to the hours required for the biennial renewal of medical licensure.

c. Chart Reviews

Prior to requesting release from the Practice Restriction, Respondent shall enter into a contract with a Board-approved monitoring company to perform periodic chart

reviews at Respondent's expense. The chart reviews shall involve current patients' charts for care rendered after the date Respondent returned to practice as stated herein. After three consecutive favorable chart reviews, Respondent may petition the Board to request termination of the Probation. Respondent shall not request early termination of the Probation without having completed the chart review process.

d. Obey All Laws

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

e. Tolling

In the event Respondent should leave Arizona to reside or practice outside the State or for any reason should Respondent stop practicing medicine in Arizona, Respondent shall notify the Executive Director in writing within ten days of departure and return or the dates of non-practice within Arizona. Non-practice is defined as any period of time exceeding thirty days during which Respondent is not engaging in the practice of medicine. Periods of temporary or permanent residence or practice outside Arizona or of non-practice within Arizona, will not apply to the reduction of the probationary period.

f. Probation Termination

Prior to the termination of Probation, Respondent must submit a written request to the Board for release from the terms of this Order. Respondent's request for release will be placed on the next pending Board agenda, provided a complete submission is received by Board staff no less than 30 days prior to the Board meeting. Respondent's request for release must be accompanied by three consecutive favorable chart reviews and must provide the Board with evidence establishing that he has successfully satisfied all of the terms and conditions of this Order.

Respondent shall not request early termination of Probation without having completed the chart review process. In the event that Respondent petitions the Board for Probation termination and the Practice Restriction is in effect at the time of the request, the Board may require any combination of examinations and/or evaluations in order to determine whether or not Respondent is safe to prescribe controlled substances. The Board may continue the Practice Restriction and Probation or take any other action consistent with its statutory and regulatory authority.

- This Order supersedes all previous consent agreements and stipulations between the Board and/or Executive Director and Respondent in this matter, and is the final resolution of this matter.
- 4. The Board retains jurisdiction and may initiate new action against Respondent based upon any violation of this Order. A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(s).

DATED AND EFFECTIVE this day of October, 2020.

ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

Patricia E. McSorley
Executive Director

CONSENT TO ENTRY OF ORDER

- 1. Respondent has read and understands this Consent Agreement and the stipulated Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order ("Order"). Respondent acknowledges he has the right to consult with legal counsel regarding this matter.
- 2. Respondent acknowledges and agrees that this Order is entered into freely and voluntarily and that no promise was made or coercion used to induce such entry.

- 3. By consenting to this Order, Respondent voluntarily relinquishes any rights to a hearing or judicial review in state or federal court on the matters alleged, or to challenge this Order in its entirety as issued by the Board, and waives any other cause of action related thereto or arising from said Order.
- 4. The Order is not effective until approved by the Board and signed by its Executive Director.
- 5. All admissions made by Respondent in this Order are solely for final disposition of this matter and any subsequent related administrative proceedings or civil litigation involving the Board and Respondent. Therefore, said admissions by Respondent are not intended or made for any other use, such as in the context of another state or federal government regulatory agency proceeding, civil or criminal court proceeding, in the State of Arizona or any other state or federal court.
- 6. Notwithstanding any language in this Order, this Order does not preclude in any way any other State agency or officer or political subdivision of this state from instituting proceedings, investigating claims, or taking legal action as may be appropriate now or in the future relating to this matter or other matters concerning Respondent, including but not limited to, violations of Arizona's Consumer Fraud Act. Respondent acknowledges that, other than with respect to the Board, this Order makes no representations, implied or otherwise, about the views or intended actions of any other state agency or officer or political subdivisions of the State relating to this matter or other matters concerning Respondent.
- 7. Upon signing this agreement, and returning this document (or a copy thereof) to the Board's Executive Director, Respondent may not revoke the consent to the entry of the Order. Respondent may not make any modifications to the document. Any

modifications to this original document are ineffective and void unless mutually approved by the parties.

- 8. This Order is a public record that will be publicly disseminated as a formal disciplinary action of the Board and will be reported to the National Practitioner's Data Bank and on the Board's web site as a disciplinary action.
- 9. If any part of the Order is later declared void or otherwise unenforceable, the remainder of the Order in its entirety shall remain in force and effect.
- 10. If the Board does not adopt this Order, Respondent will not assert as a defense that the Board's consideration of the Order constitutes bias, prejudice, prejudgment or other similar defense.
- 11. Any violation of this Order constitutes unprofessional conduct and may result in disciplinary action. A.R.S. § § 32-1401(27)(s) ("[v]iolating a formal order, probation, consent agreement or stipulation issued or entered into by the board or its executive director under this chapter.") and 32-1451.
- 12. Respondent acknowledges that, pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-2501(16), he cannot act as a supervising physician for a physician assistant while his license is on probation.
 - 13. Respondent has read and understands the conditions of Probation.

MURALI D. TALLURI, M.D.

DATED: 9-10-2020

1	EXECUTED COPY of the foregoing mailed
2	this of october, 2020 to:
3	Calvin Raup
4	Calvin L. Raup, PLLC 531 E Thomas Road, Suite 104
5	Phoenix, AZ 85012 Attorney for Respondent
6	
7	ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed this day of October, 2020 with:
8	3.000
9	Arizona Medical Board 1740 West Adams, Suite 4000
10	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
11	MichelleRobes
12	Board staff
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	