1	Rob Bonta	
2	Attorney General of California ALEXANDRA M. ALVAREZ	
3.	Supervising Deputy Attorney General JANNSEN TAN	
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 237826	
5	1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255	
6	Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7549 Facsimile: (916) 327-2247 Attorneys for Complainant	
8	in the state of th	
9	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA	
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS	
11	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
12	In the Matter of the Acquestion Against	Case No. 800-2021-082976
13	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	
14	Robert Jay Rowen, M.D. 7048 E. Hurlbut Ave. Sebastopol, CA 95472	ACCUSATION
15	1 ,	
16	2200 County Center Drive, Suite C Santa Rosa, CA 95403	
17 18	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 39465,	
19	Respondent.	
20		
21	<u>PARTIES</u>	
22	1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as	
23	the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs	
24	(Board).	
25	2. On or about June 18, 1979, the Medical Board (Board) issued Physician's and	
26	Surgeon's Certificate No. G 39465 to Robert Jay Rowen, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's	
27	and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought	
28	herein and will expire on November 30, 2024, unless renewed. On October 7, 2022, the Board	
	· 1	

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

5. Section 2234 of the Code, states:

The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- (a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.
 - (b) Gross negligence.
- (c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more negligent acts or omissions. An initial negligent act or omission followed by a separate and distinct departure from the applicable standard of care shall constitute repeated negligent acts.
- (1) An initial negligent diagnosis followed by an act or omission medically appropriate for that negligent diagnosis of the patient shall constitute a single negligent act.
- (2) When the standard of care requires a change in the diagnosis, act, or omission that constitutes the negligent act described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the standard of care.
 - (d) Incompetence.
- (e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
 - (f) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a certificate.
- (g) The failure by a certificate holder, in the absence of good cause, to attend and participate in an interview by the board. This subdivision shall only apply to a certificate holder who is the subject of an investigation by the board.
- 6. Section 726 of the Code states:
- (a) The commission of any act of sexual abuse, misconduct, or relations with a patient, client, or customer constitutes unprofessional conduct and grounds for disciplinary action for any person licensed under this or under any initiative act referred to in this division.
- (b) This section shall not apply to consensual sexual contact between a licensee and his or her spouse or person in an equivalent domestic relationship when that licensee provides medical treatment, to his or her spouse or person in an equivalent domestic relationship.

27 | ///

22

23

24

25

26

28

///

7. Section 2266 of the Code states: The failure of a physician and surgeon to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients constitutes unprofessional conduct.

COST RECOVERY

8. Section 125.3 of the Code states:

- (a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the Osteopathic Medical Board, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the administrative law judge may direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.
- (b) In the case of a disciplined licensee that is a corporation or a partnership, the order may be made against the licensed corporate entity or licensed partnership.
- (c) A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs where actual costs are not available, signed by the entity bringing the proceeding or its designated representative shall be prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case. The costs shall include the amount of investigative and enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not limited to, charges imposed by the Attorney General.
- (d) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested pursuant to subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to costs shall not be reviewable by the board to increase the cost award. The board may reduce or eliminate the cost award, or remand to the administrative law judge if the proposed decision fails to make a finding on costs requested pursuant to subdivision (a).
- (e) If an order for recovery of costs is made and timely payment is not made as directed in the board's decision, the board may enforce the order for repayment in any appropriate court. This right of enforcement shall be in addition to any other rights the board may have as to any licensee to pay costs.
- (f) In any action for recovery of costs, proof of the board's decision shall be conclusive proof of the validity of the order of payment and the terms for payment.
- (g) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the board shall not renew or reinstate the license of any licensee who has failed to pay all of the costs ordered under this section.
- (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the board may, in its discretion, conditionally renew or reinstate for a maximum of one year the license of any licensee who demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal agreement with the board to reimburse the board within that one-year period for the unpaid costs.
- (h) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement for costs incurred and shall be deposited in the fund of the board recovering the costs

to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature.

- (i) Nothing in this section shall preclude a board from including the recovery of the costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.
- (j) This section does not apply to any board if a specific statutory provision in that board's licensing act provides for recovery of costs in an administrative disciplinary proceeding.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. At all times alleged herein, Respondent, was a physician who practices Integrative, Complementary, and Alternative Medicine in Santa Rosa, California at private clinic in Santa Rosa, California.
- 10. On or about October 26, 2021, Respondent saw Patient A in his clinic. Patient A complained of "low energy" and saw Respondent for ozone therapy as well as overall preventive healthcare. Respondent documented that Patient A had seen youtube videos and was interested in ozone therapy for fatigue. Respondent documented fatigue, possibly secondary to chemical exposure at the plant where Patient A works.
- 11. During the visit, Respondent asked Patient A if she was married and stated that Patient A reminded him of his daughter, although she appeared older in appearance. Respondent did muscle testing and checked Patient A's vitals. During this time, Patient A was seated on a chair while Respondent was seated on a rolling stool. Respondent was so close to her that Patient A felt Respondent's penis on her hand. Patient A immediately moved her hand.
- 12. Patient A was asked to lie down on the exam table and Respondent performed Energy Field Testing and brushed his hand repeatedly up and down her entire chest from her neck to stomach. Respondent brushed his hand on top of Patient A's chest, Respondent told Patient A that "it was nothing personal." Respondent failed to explain to Patient A what he was going to do prior to performing the maneuver.
- 13. While Patient A's arms were hanging over the exam table, she felt his flaccid penis and testicles against her right hand. Patient A moved her hand closer to her body to avoid contact with Respondent. Respondent checked for vital signs with his stethoscope, and had Patient A lay down on his left side. Respondent used his left hand and lifted Patient A's bra without

permission. Patient A believed that Respondent saw her breasts since she was wearing a skinny, thin layered bra.

- 14. Respondent evaluated and palpated Patient A's femoral artery palpations. Respondent asked Patient A to lie down on her back. Respondent used a stethoscope, and lowered Patient A's pants and underwear away from her body and looked down her vagina. Patient A did not know what he was looking for and she felt awkward and uncomfortable. Respondent failed to explain to Patient A what he was going to do prior to performing the maneuver.
- 15. Respondent also used his hands to brush up and down 4 to 6 times, starting on top of Patient A's collar bone past Patient A's chest down to her bellybutton. Respondent told Patient A that white blood cells were detected from the laboratory testing which was performed and asked her when was the last time that she had sex.
- 16. Respondent requested a hug from Patient A as the conclusion of her examination. Patient A felt that she was "powerless", and complied with Respondent's request.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE (Sexual Abuse and Contact - Patient A)

- 17. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 2234, and 726, in that he committed sexual abuse, misconduct, relations, exploitation, contact, and/or harassment of Patient A¹. Paragraphs 9 through 16, above, are hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 18. Respondent committed sexual abuse, misconduct, relations, exploitation, contact, and/or harassment of Patient A which included, but is not limited to the following:
 - A. Respondent performed inappropriate sexual contact with his penis.
- B. Respondent repetitively brushed his hand up and down Patient A's chest, touching Patient A's nipples, while she was wearing a thin bra.

26 || ///

¹ Patient and witness names and information have been omitted to protect privacy. All witnesses will be fully identified in discovery.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE (General Unprofessional Conduct)

22. Respondent is further subject to disciplinary action under sections 2227 and 2234, as defined by section 2234, of the Code, in that he has engaged in conduct which breaches the rules or ethical code of the medical profession, or conduct which is unbecoming of a member in good standing of the medical profession, and which demonstrates an unfitness to practice medicine, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 9 through 19, above, which are hereby realleged and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

- 23. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Robert Jay Rowen, M.D., Complainant alleges that on or about August 11, 1998, in a prior disciplinary action titled *In the Matter of the Accusation Against Robert Jay Rowen, M.D.*, Certificate # No. G-39465, File No. 16-97-74289 before the Medical Board of California, Respondent's license was disciplined when the Board issued a Decision ordering that Respondent is publicly reprimanded, finding an allegation of conviction for federal tax obstruction to be true, pursuant to Section 2236 subdivision (a) of the Code. That Public Reprimand decision is now final and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 24. Respondent entered into a Plea Agreement (Plea Agreement) in *United States of America v. Robert Rowen*, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 19-cr-00468-CRB. On or about September 29, 2021, Respondent signed the Plea Agreement. The Plea Agreement was filed on October 13, 2021. In the Plea Agreement, Respondent agreed to plead guilty to the charge of Tax Evasion in violation of 26 U.S.C. section 7201.
- 25. Respondent agreed that he was guilty of the offense to which he was pleading guilty, and that the following facts (summarized below) were true:
 - that as of September 26, 2019, Respondent owed federal income tax liabilities in the amount of approximately \$1,209,587.63.
 - that Respondent willfully attempted to evade payment of his tax liability by committing various affirmative acts of evasion.

///

///

///

- that Respondent concealed income received in exchange for providing promotional research and writing articles by incorporating an entity to receive income and use those funds to purchase gold coins.
- that Respondent intentionally tried to conceal his ownership, management, and financial interest in the entity by directing other individuals to receive and deposit checks received for providing promotional research and writing articles into the entity's account; sign and issue checks from the entity's account to a gold dealer for gold purchases; and falsely represent on the entity's corporate documents and tax forms that they were 99% shareholders of the company, even though they had no ownership interest in the business, and Respondent exclusively directed payments of funds and exercised day-to-day management and control over operations.
- that in order to conceal from the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") the income that
 he earned from his medical practice, from approximately January 2007 through
 April 2014, Respondent instructed patients, either personally or through staff, to
 make their checks for medical services payable to a gold dealer.
- that Respondent deposited these patient checks, along with other checks, into bank
 accounts for a gold dealer, and pursuant to arrangements Respondent made with a
 gold dealer, in exchange for these deposits, a gold dealer would send Respondent
 gold and silver coins.
- that Respondent admitted he deposited these patient checks into these bank accounts in order to conceal his assets from IRS collection.
- that between 2008 and 2013, Respondent used his income from providing promotional research and writing articles, along with income from his medical practice, to purchase more than \$3.7 million in gold and silver coins from a gold dealer.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Medical Board of California issue a decision:

- Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 39465, issued 1. to Robert Jay Rowen, M.D.;
- 2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Robert Jay Rowen, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;
- 3. Ordering Robert Jay Rowen, M.D., to pay the Board the costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and if placed on probation, the costs of probation monitoring;
- Ordering Respondent Robert Jay Rowen, M.D., if placed on probation, to provide patient notification in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 2228.1; and
 - 5. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: JUN 2 9 2023

VARGHESE Executive Director Medical Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant

SA2023302033 37193478.docx

25

26

28