1	XAVIER BECERRA		
2	Attorney General of California JANICE K. LACHMAN		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General DANIEL D. MCGEE		
	Deputy Attorney General	FILED	
4	State Bar No. 218947 1300 I Street, Suite 125	NOV 1 2 2019	
5	P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550	SACRAMENTO	
6 7	Telephone: (916) 210-7895 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 Attorneys for Complainant	DBC ENFORCEMENT	
		F THE	
8	BEFORE THE DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA		
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10		1	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 4402018002387	
12	JEFFREY ALAN SULITZER, DMD		
13	15569 SE Chelsea Morning Dr. Happy Valley, OR 97086	ACCUSATION	
14	Dental License No. 51841,		
15	Respondent.		
16		J	
17	Complainant alleges:		
18	<u>PARTIES</u>		
19	1. Karen M. Fischer (Complainant) brir	gs this Accusation solely in her official capacity	
20	as the Executive Officer of the Dental Board of California (Board), Department of Consumer		
21	Affairs.		
22	2. On or about October 7, 2003, the Board issued Dental License No. 51841 to Jeffrey		
23	Alan Sulitzer, DMD (Respondent). The Dental License was in full force and effect at all times		
24	relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on June 30, 2021, unless renewed.		
25	JURISDICTION		
26	3. This Accusation is brought before the Dental Board of California (Board),		
27	Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section		
28	references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.		
	1		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

11

4. Code section 118, subdivision (b), provides that the suspension, expiration, surrender or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.

5. Code section 1670 states:

Any licentiate may have his license revoked or suspended or be reprimanded or be placed on probation by the board for unprofessional conduct, or incompetence, or gross negligence, or repeated acts of negligence in his or her profession, or for the issuance of a license by mistake, or for any other cause applicable to the licentiate provided in this chapter. The proceedings under this article shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, and the board shall have all the powers granted therein.

6. Code section 1807 states:

A dental corporation shall not do or fail to do any act the doing of which or the failure to do which would constitute unprofessional conduct under any statute, rule or regulation now or hereafter in effect. In the conduct of its practice, it shall observe and be bound by such statutes, rules and regulations to the same extent as a person holding a license under Section 1634 of this code. The board shall have the same powers of suspension, revocation and discipline against a dental corporation as are now or hereafter authorized by Section 1670 of this code, or by any other similar statute against individual licensees, provided, however, that proceedings against a dental corporation shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, and the board shall have all the powers granted therein.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

7. Code section 1625 states:

Dentistry is the diagnosis or treatment, by surgery or other method, of diseases and lesions and the correction of malpositions of the human teeth, alveolar process, gums, jaws, or associated structures; and such diagnosis or treatment may include all necessary related procedures as well as the use of drugs, anesthetic agents, and physical evaluation. Without limiting the foregoing, a person practices dentistry within the meaning of this chapter who does any one or more of the following:

(a) By card, circular, pamphlet, newspaper or in any other way advertises himself or represents himself to be a dentist.

28

- (1) "Mobile dental unit" means a self-contained facility, which may include a trailer or van, in which dentistry is practiced that may be moved, towed, or transported from one location to another...
- (b) A mobile dental unit, or a dental practice that routinely uses portable dental units to provide treatment in nondental office locations, shall be registered and operated in accordance with regulations established by the board. These regulations shall not be designed to prevent or lessen competition in service areas. The regulations shall require the registrant to identify a licensed dentist responsible for the mobile dental unit or portable practice, and shall include, but shall not be limited to, requirements for availability of followup and emergency care, maintenance and availability of provider and patient records, and treatment information to be provided to patients and other appropriate parties. A mobile dental unit, or a dental practice using portable dental units, registered and operated in accordance with the board's regulations and that has paid the fees established by the board, including a mobile dental unit registered for the purpose specified in subdivision (e), shall otherwise be exempt from this article and Article 3.5 (commencing with Section 1658).
- 10. Code section 1658 states, in pertinent part:
 - (a) When a licensee desires to have more than one place of practice, he or she shall, prior to the opening of the additional office, apply to the board, pay the fee required by this chapter, and receive permission in writing from the board to have the additional place of practice.

"Place of practice" means any dental office where any act of dentistry is practiced as defined by Section 1625, and includes a place of practice in which the applicant holds any proprietary interest of any nature whatsoever, or in which he or she holds any right to participate in the management or control thereof. A dentist who is the lessor of a dental office shall not be deemed to hold a proprietary interest in that place of practice, unless he or she is entitled to participate in the management or control of the dentistry practiced there.

11. Code section 1658.1 states:

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit a licensed dentist from maintaining more than one dental office in this state if all of the following conditions are met:

- (a) In addition to any existing legal responsibility or liability, a dentist maintaining more than one office shall assume legal responsibility and liability for the dental services rendered in each of the offices maintained by the dentist.
- (b) A dentist maintaining more than one office shall ensure that each office is in compliance with the supervision requirements of this chapter.

that dentist. A dentist may, however, after conducting a preliminary oral examination, require or permit any dental auxiliary to perform procedures necessary for diagnostic purposes, provided that the procedures are permitted under the auxiliary's authorized scope of practice....

(b) For purposes of this section, "patient of record" refers to a patient who has been examined, has had a medical and dental history completed and evaluated, and has had oral conditions diagnosed and a written plan developed by the licensed dentist.

14. Code section 1685 states:

In addition to other acts constituting unprofessional conduct under this chapter, it is unprofessional conduct for a person licensed under this chapter to require, either directly or through an office policy, or knowingly permit the delivery of dental care that discourages necessary treatment or permits clearly excessive treatment, incompetent treatment, grossly negligent treatment, repeated negligent acts, or unnecessary treatment, as determined by the standard of practice in the community.

15. Code section 1741 states, in pertinent part:

- (b) "Direct supervision" means supervision of dental procedures based on instructions given by a licensed dentist, who must be physically present in the treatment facility during the performance of those procedures.
- (c) "General supervision" means supervision of dental procedures based on instructions given by a licensed dentist but not requiring the physical presence of the supervising dentist during the performance of those procedures.

16. Code section 1701.5 states:

Any association or partnership or corporation or group of three or more dentists, engaging in practice under any name that would otherwise be in violation of Section 1701 may practice under this name if, and only if, the association, partnership, corporation or group holds an outstanding, unexpired, unsuspended, and unrevoked permit issued by the board under this section. On and after July 1, 1995, any individual dentist or pair of dentists engaging in the practice of dentistry under any name that would otherwise be in violation of Section 1701 may practice under that name if and only if the dentist or pair of dentists hold an outstanding, unexpired, unsuspended, and unrevoked permit issued by the board under this section. The board shall issue written permits authorizing the holder to use a name specified in the permit in connection with the holder's practice if, and only if, the board finds to its satisfaction that:

(a) The applicant or applicants are duly licensed dentists.

- (b) The place or establishment, or the portion thereof, where the applicant or applicants practice, is owned or leased by the applicant or applicants, and the practice conducted at the place or establishment, or portion thereof, is wholly owned and entirely controlled by the applicant or applicants.
- (c) The name that the applicant or applicants propose to operate contains at least one of the following designations: "dental group," "dental practice," or "dental office" and contains the family name of one or more of the past, present, or prospective associates, partners, shareholders, or members of the group, and is in conformity with Section 651 and subdivisions (i) and (l) of Section 1680.
- (d) All licensed persons practicing at the location designated in the application hold valid and outstanding licenses and that no charges of unprofessional conduct are pending against any persons practicing at that location.

Permits issued under this section by the board shall expire and become invalid unless renewed at the times and in the manner provided for the renewal of certificates issued under this chapter.

Any permits issued under this section may be revoked or suspended at any time that the board finds that any one of the requirements for original issuance of a permit is no longer being fulfilled by the holder to whom the permit was issued. Proceedings for revocation or suspension shall be governed by the Administrative Procedure Act.

In the event charges of unprofessional conduct are filed against the holder of a permit issued under this section, or a member of an association or partnership or a member of a group or corporation to whom a permit has been issued under this section, proceedings shall not be commenced for revocation or suspension of the permit until final determination of the charges of unprofessional conduct and unless the charges have resulted in revocation or suspension of license.

17. Code section 1750 states:

- (a) A dental assistant is an individual who, without a license, may perform basic supportive dental procedures, as authorized by Section 1750.1 and by regulations adopted by the board, under the supervision of a licensed dentist. "Basic supportive dental procedures" are those procedures that have technically elementary characteristics, are completely reversible, and are unlikely to precipitate potentially hazardous conditions for the patient being treated.
- (b) The supervising licensed dentist shall be responsible for determining the competency of the dental assistant to perform the basic supportive dental procedures, as authorized by Section 1750.1.

the fee prescribed in Section 1021 for application for an additional office permit.	
The board shall inform an applicant for a permit in writing within 7 days	
whether the application is complete and accepted for filing or is deficient and what specific information is required.	
The board shall decide within 60 days after the filing of a completed	
application whether the applicant meets the requirements of a permit.	
(c) Requirements.	
(1) The applicant shall certify that:	
(A) There is a written procedure for emergency follow-up care for patients	
arrangements for treatment in a dental facility which is permanently	
enable the operator thereof to contact necessary parties in the event of a	
local laws, regulations and ordinances dealing with radiographic equipment, flammability, construction, sanitation and zoning and the applicant possesses all applicable county and city licenses or permits to	
(D) The driver of the unit possesses a valid California driver's license.	
(2) The applicant shall maintain an official business or mailing address of record which shall be filed with the board. The board shall be notified	
within 30 days of any change in the address of record. All written or	
shall contain the official address of record for the mobile dental clinic.	
(3) Each mobile dental clinic shall:	
(A) Have ready access to a ramp or lift if services are provided to disabled	
(C) Have ready access to an adequate supply of potable water, including hot water.	
(D) Have ready access to tollect facilities.	
	permit. The board shall inform an applicant for a permit in writing within 7 days whether the application is complete and accepted for filing or is deficient and what specific information is required. The board shall decide within 60 days after the filing of a completed application whether the applicant meets the requirements of a permit. (c) Requirements. (l) The applicant shall certify that: (A) There is a written procedure for emergency follow-up care for patients treated in the mobile dental clinic and that such procedure includes arrangements for treatment in a dental facility which is permanently established in the area. (B) The mobile dental clinic has communication facilities which will enable the operator thereof to contact necessary parties in the event of a medical or dental emergency. (C) The mobile dental clinic conforms to all applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations and ordinances dealing with radiographic equipment, flammability, construction, sanitation and zoning and the applicant possesses all applicable county and city licenses or permits to operate the unit. (D) The driver of the unit possesses a valid California driver's license. (2) The applicant shall maintain an official business or mailing address of record which shall be filed with the board. The board shall be notified within 30 days of any change in the address of record. All written or printed documents available from or issued by the mobile dental clinic shall contain the official address of record for the mobile dental clinic shall contain the official address of record for the mobile dental clinic. (3) Each mobile dental clinic shall: (A) Have ready access to a ramp or lift if services are provided to disabled persons. (B) Have a properly functioning sterilization system.

Such notice shall be readily accessible to all individuals under supervision of the dentist.

COST RECOVERY

27. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate 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, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be included in a stipulated settlement.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 28. The timeframe relevant to the charges and allegations set forth herein includes the period of April 13, 2017 until the date of the filing of this Accusation.
- 29. As alleged hereinabove, Jeffrey Sulitzer, DMD (Respondent) is a California licensed dentist. Respondent has formed a professional corporation and is registered with the California Secretary of State as "Jeffrey Sulitzer, D.M.D., Professional Corporation." The Articles of Incorporation for Respondent's professional corporation state that the purpose of the corporation is to engage in the profession of dentistry.
- 30. A Statement of Information that Respondent filed for his professional corporation (dated August 2, 2018) states that the address for the professional corporation is 414 Union Street, 8th Floor, Nashville, TN 37219 the same address as the "Company" that is described below.
- 31. Respondent held himself out as being the Chief Clinical Officer for an out-of-state business consisting of a parent company and wholly owned subsidiaries that advertises, treatment plans, fabricates, manufactures and sells custom-made clear orthodontic aligners directly to patients (hereinafter, the "Company").
- 32. The Company is owned and controlled by non-dentist persons and entities and is not registered with the California Department of Managed Health Care as a health care service plan.

 Nor does the Company possess a Knox-Keene Act license that would exempt it from the Moscone-Knox Act requirements of ownership.

- 33. To further its sale of orthodontic aligners, the Company, utilizing its trademarks and trade dress, owns and/or operates scores of dental offices throughout the United States, including over 20 offices in California. The Company also furthers its sale of orthodontic aligners through the internet and mobile dental units.
- 34. The Company provides (and during the timeframe relevant to this accusation provided) its aligners directly to patients utilizing one of two models, ostensibly using a teledentistry platform. In the first model, after a patient completes an online dental self-assessment, the patient is directed to order an at-home dental impression kit that the Company sends to the patient. The Company then requests the patient to make their own dental impression using the at-home dental impression kit and to return the resulting cast to the Company. The Company then uses the cast to create a 3D computer image of the patient's dentition intended for the purpose of orthodontic treatment planning and for the fabrication and manufacture of custom-made orthodontic aligners for the patient.
- 35. In the second model, the patient visits either a dental office or mobile dental unit. At these locations, a dental assistant obtains the patient's medical history and signature on an informed consent form that describes the benefits and risks pertaining to orthodontic treatment. This informed consent form also includes provisions whereby the patient consents to the use of telehealth and purports to "release [the Company] from liability for any claims by me or any third party in connection with my participation or use of the invisible aligner treatment." Dental assistants also request the patient to self-verify their own dental health by stating, in writing, that they have had a prior exam with a licensed dentist who purportedly cleared the patient for the Company's orthodontic aligner treatment. Once the patient completes the necessary forms, a dental assistant, using an iTero 3D (or like) scanner, performs an intraoral dental scan that creates a 3D dental image for purposes of orthodontic treatment planning and the fabrication and manufacture of custom-made orthodontic aligners.
- 36. In both models described above, the Company sends the 3D dental image to its own facilities for orthodontic aligner treatment planning. Once the treatment plan is completed, it is supposedly reviewed by a state-licensed dentist who has contracted with the Company. Without

first examining the patient, the dentist either approves or denies the orthodontic aligner treatment plan. If approved, the Company uses the 3D dental image of the patient's dentition to create a set of clear dental aligners to treat the patient. The Company sends those aligners directly to the patient.

- 37. In both models, patients do not interact with the dentists who reviewed their 3D dental image. Nor do patients receive the name, address, or contact information of the dentists who approve their treatment plan.
- 38. In both models, dental or orthodontic follow-up appointments are not scheduled for patients during their orthodontic treatment. Instead, the patient is requested to photograph their own dentition approximately every 90 days and to transmit those photographs to the Company so that a dentist can review them. If problems occur during treatment, the patient is referred to the Company's customer service department and not to any particular licensed dentist.
- 39. In and around 2017 and 2018, Respondent, through his professional corporation, began applying to the Board for several Fictitious Name Permits (FNPs) utilizing the Company's name and characterizing it as his own dental group. With respect to each of these FNP applications, Respondent stated, under penalty of perjury, that "[t]he dental practice at the location specified on this application is wholly owned and entirely controlled by this corporation." Respondent's representations, however, were false; the FNPs were instead for dental offices that the Company in fact owned and controlled, either entirely or in part. Based on Respondent's representations, the Board issued the following FNPs to Respondent's professional corporation: FNP Nos. 13995, 13996, 13997, 13998, 13999, 14180, 14181, 14182 and 14209. Three of these FNPs were issued for the following dental offices:
- (i) FNP no. 13995 for a dental office located at 1111 Broadway, Oakland, CA ("Oakland Office");
- (ii) FNP no. 13996 for a dental office located at 655 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, CA ("San Francisco Office"); and,
- (iii) FNP no. 13999 for a dental office located at 1601 Vine Street, 6th Fl., Los Angeles, CA ("L.A. Office").

During the timeframe relevant to this Accusations, these dental offices that Respondent claimed to wholly own and entirely control were in operation and utilized the orthodontic treatment model in the orthodontic treatment of patients described in the Factual Background section of this Accusation.

- 40. Further, in and around 2017 and 2018, Respondent, through his professional corporation, began applying to the Board for several Additional Office Permits (AOPs). With respect to each of the AOP applications, Respondent stated, under penalty of perjury, that he accepted legal responsibility and liability for dental services rendered in each dental office he maintained. This representation, however, was contradicted by the full release language contained in the Company's consent forms that patients were requested to sign at the dental offices that Respondent claimed to wholly own and entirely control.
- 41. Respondent also represented in the AOP applications that all dental offices he operated were in compliance with Code section 1658.1, and that in each office, there was posted in an area visible to patients a sign setting forth Respondent's name, mailing address, telephone number and dental license number. These representations, as alleged in greater detail in paragraphs 46-48 below, were also false. Based on Respondent's false representations, the Board issued the following AOPs to Respondent's professional corporation: AOP Nos. 79557, 79646, 79647, 79648 and 79664. Respondent has since applied to the Board for several other FNPs and AOPs making these same misrepresentations.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Use of Fraud in the Procurement of Fictitious Name Permits and Additional Office Permits)

- 42. Respondent, both individually and through his professional corporation, is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct under Code section 1680, subdivision (w), in that he used fraud in the procurement of permits issued pursuant to the Dental Practice Act, Code sections 1600, et seq.
- 43. Specifically, and as alleged in greater detail above, when applying for FNPs for various dental offices located throughout California, Respondent represented under penalty of

perjury that he wholly owned and entirely controlled the subject offices. These representations were false. The subject dental offices were in fact owned and controlled, either entirely or in part, by the Company.

- 44. Further, when applying for AOPs for the various dental offices located throughout California, Respondent represented under penalty of perjury that:
- (i) He accepted legal responsibility and liability for dental services rendered in the offices:
- (ii) The offices were in compliance with section 1658.1 and all other applicable State and Federal laws, including that the offices were in compliance with the supervision requirements of the Dental Practice Act; and,
- (iii) In the offices there was visibly posted in an area likely to be seen by all patients using the facility a sign with Respondent's name, mailing address, telephone number, and dental license number.
- 45. Respondent's representations set forth in paragraph 46 were false. The true facts were that Respondent did not accept legal responsibility and liability for dental services rendered in the dental offices. Instead, patients presenting at the offices were requested to execute informed consent forms in which it was stated: "I release [the Company] from liability for any claims by me or any third party in connection with my participation or use of the invisible aligner treatment," tending to deceive patients into believing that they have no legal recourse for the aligner treatment that Respondent was supposedly to render.
- 46. Further, the San Francisco Office, Oakland Office, and L.A. Office were not in compliance with section 1658.1 and all other applicable state and federal laws as Respondent had affirmatively represented because:
- (i) As alleged in greater detail below in paragraph 57, the offices failed to comply with the supervision requirements of the Dental Practice Act in that dental assistants were permitted to take without direct supervision health histories and intraoral 3D scan impressions of patients' dentition for the purpose of orthodontic diagnosis and treatment planning, including for the fabrication and manufacture of orthodontic aligners, in violation of Code section 1750.1,

associated with the Company. Patients were also requested to complete and submit health history and consent forms bearing the Company's name and trademarks and which did not include Respondent's name. Included in those forms was language whereby the patient agreed to waive any liability to the Company for orthodontic aligner treatment. Further, patients presenting at the dental offices were provided with materials and products bearing the Company's name, trademarks and trade dress.

- 50. These circumstances tended to deceive or otherwise mislead the public into concluding that they were presenting at the Company's business instead of Respondent's dental practice.
- 51. Alternatively, since Respondent was holding himself out as being the owner of the offices that the Company in fact owned and controlled, entirely or in part, patients were led to believe that they were at Respondent's dental practice when in fact they were at the Company's place of business.
- 52. Alternatively, patients presenting at the dental offices were led to believe that Respondent and the Company were one and the same when they are not.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Treatment of Patients Not of Record)

- 53. Respondent, both individually and through his professional corporation, is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct under Code section 1684.5, in that he performed or allowed to be performed treatment on patients that were not his patient of record as follows.
- 54. As alleged in greater detail above, patients presented at dental offices that Respondent claimed to own and control to obtain orthodontic aligner treatment. At these dental offices, patients were requested to self-verify their own dental health, following which dental assistants utilized 3D scanners to generate digital scans of patients' dentition, intended for diagnosing tooth misalignments, orthodontic treatment planning, and the fabrication of custom-made orthodontic aligners. However, neither Respondent nor any dentist working under him was present to conduct any examination of the patient prior to orthodontic treatment or preliminary examination

prior to procedures being performed by dental assistants, as Code section 1684.5, subsections (a) and (b) require.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Aiding and Abetting the Unlicensed Practice of Dentistry)

- 55. Respondent, both individually and through his professional corporation, is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct under Code section 1680, subsection (c), in that he aided and abetted the Company in the unlicensed practice of dentistry, as defined by Code section 1625. The Company performed the unlicensed practice of dentistry as follows:
- (i) The Company practiced dentistry by performing, or offering to perform, orthodontic diagnosis and the treatment of malposed teeth, which is the practice of dentistry as defined by Code section 1625, subsection (b);
- (ii) The Company indicated that it would perform orthodontic treatment and construct, alter, repair, or sell orthodontic appliances, which is the practice of dentistry as defined by Code section 1625, subsection (c);
- (iii) The Company managed or conducted as manager, proprietor, conductor, lessor, or otherwise, places where dental procedures were performed, which is the practice of dentistry as defined by Code section 1625, subsection (e); and/or,
- (iv) The Company advertised, fabricated, manufactured and sold orthodontic appliances directly to consumers when the casts and/or impressions for the work had not been made or taken by any licensed dentist (Respondent or otherwise) and without any written authorization for the work by Respondent or any other dentist, which is the practice of dentistry as defined by Code section 1626, subsection (e).
 - 56. Respondent aided and abetted in this unlawful scheme in that he:
- (i) Held himself out as the dentist of record for the Company's various dental offices and mobile dental units in California;
- (ii) Falsely represented that he wholly owned and entirely controlled the subject dental offices and mobile dental units when he did not;
 - (iii) Performed or otherwise permitted orthodontic treatment on persons who

treatment planning and for the fabrication and manufacture of orthodontic appliances.

Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted gross negligence, repeated negligence and/or incompetence;

- (ii) Respondent encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted the treatment of patients who were not his patient of record and without the proper patient-dentist relationship being established and proper orthodontic diagnostic records created. Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted gross negligence, repeated negligence and/or incompetence;
- (iii) Respondent encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic aligner treatment to patients without first obtaining a proper health history and dental history for the patient. Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted gross negligence, repeated negligence and/or incompetence;
- (iv) Respondent encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic aligner treatment to patients without first performing a full oral examination of the patient including, *inter alia*, the taking of proper radiographs (e.g., full-mouth x-rays, panorex and/or cephalometric x-rays) and periodontal probings so as to rule out health or dental conditions that are contraindicated to orthodontic treatment (e.g., periodontitis, shortened roots, root resorption, etc.). Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted gross negligence, repeated negligence and/or incompetence;
- (v) Respondent encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic aligner treatment to patients without proper orthodontic records, cephalometric analysis or tracing (photographs and digitally scanned models standing alone do not constitute full orthodontic records sufficient to adequately diagnose a patient). Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted gross negligence, repeated negligence and/or incompetence;
- (vi) Respondent encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic aligner treatment to patients whereby treatment plans entailing only the Company's orthodontic aligners were presented without any alternative treatment options (including, for example, extractions, surgery, other orthodontic approaches such as traditional braces, or no

treatment at all). Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted gross negligence, repeated negligence and/or incompetence. Further, Respondent's general practice in this regard tended to discourage necessary treatment or to otherwise encourage unnecessary treatment;

- (vii) Respondent encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic aligner treatment to patients without first obtaining the patients' adequate informed consent. Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted repeated negligence;
- (viii) Respondent encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic aligner treatment to patients without the proper follow up and/or monitoring of the orthodontic movement of teeth. Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted gross negligence, repeated negligence and/or incompetence; and/or,
- (ix) Respondent encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic aligner treatment to patients without final records so as to document case results. Respondent's general practice in this regard constituted gross negligence, repeated negligence and/or incompetence.

EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Violations of the Telehealth Statute)

- 59. Respondent, both individually and through his professional corporation, is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct under Code section 2290.5, subsection (d), in that he violated the law pertaining to telehealth in the following respects:
- (i) Respondent delivered orthodontic treatment via the use of telehealth. However, neither Respondent nor any licensed health care provider working under him obtained the patient's consent to the use of telehealth, contrary to the provisions of Code section 2290.5, subsection (b);
- (ii) In utilizing telehealth to deliver orthodontic treatment to patients, Respondent, contrary to the provisions of Code section 2290.5, subsection (e), altered the scope of practice for orthodontics by limiting the acts that an orthodontist is obligated to perform during orthodontic treatment in that Respondent:
 - (a) Encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic

//

treatment on patients without the proper patient-dentist relationship being established, which under Code section 1684.5, subsections (a) and (b) would include a preliminary examination, proper evaluation of medical and dental history, diagnosis of oral conditions and written treatment planning by a licensed dentist;

- (b) Encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic treatment on patients without proper orthodontic diagnostic records and/or treatment plans (including alternatives);
- (c) Encouraged, provided, authorized and/or otherwise permitted orthodontic treatment on patients without obtaining the patient's adequate informed consent;
- (d) Failed to provide direct supervision over dental assistants who performed functions that require direct supervision; and/or,
 - (e) Failed to adequately monitor the orthodontic movement of teeth; and/or,
- (iii) Respondent's treatment approach through telehealth precluded patients from receiving in-person treatment, contrary to the provisions of Code section 2290.5, subsection (c).

NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Operation of Non-Permitted Mobile Dental Unit)

60. Respondent, both individually and by and through his professional corporation, is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct under Code section 1680, subsection (n) for violating Code section 1657, subsection (b), in that on or about on or about July 1, 2019, he operated a mobile dental unit at the Arden Fair Mall in Sacramento, California when that mobile dental unit was not registered with the Board in accordance with title 16, CCR section 1049.

PRAYER

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

- 1. Revoking or suspending Dental License No. 51841, issued to Jeffrey Alan Sulitzer, DMD (Respondent);
 - 2. Ordering Respondent to pay the Dental Board of California the reasonable costs of

1	the investigation and enforcement of this case, and, if placed on probation, the costs of probation		
2	monitoring; and,		
3	3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.		
4			
5	DATED:	KAREN M. FISCHER	
6		Executive Officer	
7		Dental Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs State of California	
8		State of California Complainant	
9	SA2019102700	•	
10	14246720.docx		
11	,		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	у.		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		24	
		(JEFFREY ALAN SULITZER, DMD) ACCUSATION	