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FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
AND
ORDER

The above-entitled matter came on regularly for decision before the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners, (hereinafter "Board"), on Saturday, December 4, 1999. Respondent, William O. Murray, M.D. (hereinafter "Dr. Murray"), was not present at the meeting, nor was anyone present who stated they represented Dr. Murray.

The members of the Board participating in the decision were, Mr. Arne D. Rosencrantz, President, Rex T. Baggett, M.D., Susan S. Buchwald, M.D., Paul A. Stewart, M.D., Cheryl A. Hug-English, M.D., and Donald H. Baepler, Ph.D. Participating as legal counsel to the Board was Leslie A. Nielsen, Assistant Chief Deputy Attorney General. All remaining members of the Board being members of the Investigative Committee that issued the complaint in this matter were excused from participating and took no part in the proceedings of the Board.
The Board having received a copy of the hearing transcript, the synopsis of
the hearing officer, and being provided with the complaint and exhibits in this matter,
and having reviewed all the above proceeded to make a decision pursuant to the
provisions of NRS 630.352.

The Board after due consideration of the record, evidence and law, and being
fully advised in the premises, makes its FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Dr. Murray is licensed to practice medicine in the state of Nevada, and
at all times alleged in the complaint on file herein, was so licensed by the Board.

2. A complaint was filed on June 22, 1999, against Dr. Murray alleging
violations of Chapter 630 of the Nevada Revised Statutes in Fifty-Nine (59) separate
counts.

3. That the allegations of Count One of the complaint have been proven
by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an
unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient A, a patient
of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

4. That the allegations of Count Two of the complaint have been proven
by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for
the care of a patient - Patient A - to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to
know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions
of NRS 630.305(1)(f).
5. That the allegations of Count Three of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient B, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

6. That the allegations of Count Four of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient - Patient B - to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

7. That the allegations of Count Five of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J. Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the monies received from Patient B for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient B, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

8. That the allegations of Count Six of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient B was never disclosed to Patient B by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).

9. That the allegations of Count Seven of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient B fail to
show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient B, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

10. That the allegations of Count Eight of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient C, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

11. That the allegations of Count Nine of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient C – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

12. That the allegations of Count Ten of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J. Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the monies received from Patient C for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray’s objective evaluation or treatment of Patient C, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

13. That the allegations of Count Eleven of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient C was never disclosed to Patient C by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).
14. That the allegations of Count Twelve of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient C fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient C, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

15. That the allegations of Count Thirteen of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient D, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

16. That the allegations of Count Fourteen of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient D – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

17. That the allegations of Count Fifteen of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J. Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the monies received from Patient D for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray’s objective evaluation or treatment of Patient D, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

18. That the allegations of Count Sixteen of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of
Patient D was never disclosed to Patient D by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).

19. That the allegations of Count Seventeen of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient D fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient D, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

20. That the allegations of Count Eighteen of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient E, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

21. That the allegations of Count Nineteen of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient E – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

22. That the allegations of Count Twenty of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient E fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient E, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

23. That the allegations of Count Twenty-One of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient F, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).
24. That the allegations of Count Twenty-Two of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient F – to a person who Dr. Murray, knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

25. That the allegations of Count Twenty-Three of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J. Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the monies received from Patient F for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray’s objective evaluation or treatment of Patient F, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

26. That the allegations of Count Twenty-Four of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient F was never disclosed to Patient F by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).

27. That the allegations of Count Twenty-Five of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient F fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr Murray was providing to Patient F, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

28. That the allegations of Count Twenty-Six of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an
unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient G, a patient
of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

29. That the allegations of Count Twenty-Seven of the complaint have been
proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the
responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient G – to a person who Dr. Murray knew,
or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation
of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

30. That the allegations of Count Twenty-Eight of the complaint have been
proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient G
fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient G,
a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

31. That the allegations of Count Twenty-Nine of the complaint have been
proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an
unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient H, a patient
of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

32. That the allegations of Count Thirty of the complaint have been proven
by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for
the care of a patient – Patient H – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to
know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions
of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

33. That the allegations of Count Thirty-One of the complaint have been
proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J.
Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of
the monies received from Patient H for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray’s objective evaluation or treatment of Patient H, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

34. That the allegations of Count Thirty-Two of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient H was never disclosed to Patient H by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).

35. That the allegations of Count Thirty-Three of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records of Patient H fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient H, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

36. That the allegations of Count Thirty-Four of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient I, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

37. That the allegations of Count Thirty-Five of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient I – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).
38. That the allegations of Count Thirty-Six of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J. Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the monies received from Patient I for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient I, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

39. That the allegations of Count Thirty-Seven of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient I was never disclosed to Patient I by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).

40. That the allegations of Count Thirty-Eight of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records of Patient I fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient I, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

41. That the allegations of Count Thirty-Nine of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient J, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

42. That the allegations of Count Forty of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient J – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to
know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

43. That the allegations of Count Forty-One of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J. Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the monies received from Patient J for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient J, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

44. That the allegations of Count Forty-Two of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient J was never disclosed to Patient J by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).

45. That the allegations of Count Forty-Three of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient J fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient J, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

46. That the allegations of Count Forty-Four of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient K, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).
47. That the allegations of Count Forty-Five of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient K – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

48. That the allegations of Count Forty-Six of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J. Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the monies received from Patient K for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray’s objective evaluation or treatment of Patient K, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

49. That the allegations of Count Forty-Seven of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient K was never disclosed to Patient K by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).

50. That the allegations of Count Forty-Eight of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient K fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient K, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

51. That the allegations of Count Forty-Nine of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an
unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient L, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

52. That the allegations of Count Fifty of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient L – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

53. That the allegations of Count Fifty-One of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records of Patient L fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient L, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

54. That the allegations of Count Fifty-Two of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient M, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

55. That the allegations of Count Fifty-Three of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient M – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

56. That the allegations of Count Fifty-Four of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient M
fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient M, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

57. That the allegations of Count Fifty-Five of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray aided and assisted an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on Patient N, a patient of Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e).

58. That the allegations of Count Fifty-Six of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray delegated the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient N – to a person who Dr. Murray knew, or had reason to know, was not qualified to undertake that responsibility, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f).

59. That the allegations of Count Fifty-Seven of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that Dr. Murray received from William J. Leavitt, Jr., compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the monies received from Patient N for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient N, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a).

60. That the allegations of Count Fifty-Eight of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient N was never disclosed to Patient N by Dr. Murray, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g).
61. That the allegations of Count Fifty-Nine of the complaint have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the medical records on Patient N fail to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient N, a violation of the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1).

62. If any of the foregoing Findings of Fact is more properly deemed a Conclusion of Law, it may be so construed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Board has jurisdiction over Respondent.

2. Respondent was properly served with notice of hearing before a Hearing officer of the Board.

3. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient A.

4. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient A – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

5. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient B.

6. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient B – to a person who
Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

7. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of monies received from a patient – Patient B – for services rendered by William A. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient B.

8. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient B, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient B by Dr. Murray.

9. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient B.

10. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient C.

11. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient C – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

12. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of
monies received from a patient – Patient C – for services rendered by William A. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient C.

13. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient C, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient C by Dr. Murray.

14. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient C.

15. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient D.

16. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient D – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

17. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of monies received from a patient – Patient D – for services rendered by William A. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient D.
18. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient D, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient D by Dr. Murray.

19. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient D.

20. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient E.

21. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient E – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

22. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient E.

23. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient F.

24. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient F – to a person who
Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

25. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of monies received from a patient – Patient F – for services rendered by William A. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient F.

26. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient F, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient F by Dr. Murray.

27. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient F.

28. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient G.

29. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient G – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.
30. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient G.

31. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient H.

32. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient H – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had had reason to know as not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

33. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of monies received from a patient – Patient H – for services rendered by William A. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient H.

34. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient H, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient H by Dr. Murray.

35. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient H.
36. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient I.

37. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient I – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

38. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of monies received from a patient – Patient I – for services rendered by William A. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray’s objective evaluation or treatment of Patient I.

39. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient I, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient I by Dr. Murray.

40. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient I.

41. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient J.
42. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient J – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

43. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of monies received from a patient – Patient J – for services rendered by William J. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation or treatment of Patient J.

44. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr Murray had in his treatment of Patient J, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient J by Dr. Murray.

45. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient J.

46. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient K.

47. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient K – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.
48. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of monies received from a patient – Patient K – for services rendered by William A. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray’s objective evaluation or treatment of Patient K.

49. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient K, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient K by Dr. Murray.

50. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr Murray was providing to Patient K.

51. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient L.

52. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient L – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

53. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient L.
54. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient M.

55. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient M – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

56. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient M.

57. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(e), by aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada on a patient of Dr. Murray – Patient N.

58. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(f), by delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient – Patient N – to a person who Dr. Murray knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility.

59. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(a), by receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of monies received from a patient – Patient N – for services rendered by William A. Leavitt, Jr., which tended to influence Dr. Murray’s objective evaluation or treatment of Patient N.
60. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.305(1)(g), by engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation which resulted in a financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of Patient N, which arrangement was never disclosed to Patient N by Dr. Murray.

61. Dr. Murray has violated the provisions of NRS 630.3062(1), by failing to maintain medical records that show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to Patient N.

62. Dr. Murray is Guilty of Fourteen (14) Counts of aiding and assisting an unlicensed person to practice medicine in the state of Nevada as alleged in Counts One (1), Three (3), Eight (8), Thirteen (13), Eighteen (18), Twenty-One (21), Twenty-Six (26), Twenty-Nine (29), Thirty-Four (34), Thirty-Nine (39), Forty-Four (44), Forty-Nine (49), Fifty-Two (52) and Fifty-Five (55) of the Complaint.

63. Dr. Murray is Guilty of Fourteen (14) Counts of delegating the responsibility for the care of a patient to a person who he knew or had reason to know was not qualified to undertake that responsibility as alleged in Counts Two (2), Four (4), Nine (9), Fourteen (14), Nineteen (19), Twenty-Two (22), Twenty-Seven (27), Thirty (30), Thirty-Five (35), Forty (40), Forty-Five (45), Fifty (50), Fifty-Three (53), and Fifty-Six (56) of the Complaint.

64. Dr. Murray is Guilty of Nine (9) Counts of receiving compensation by way of a fee, commission, or rebate of a percentage of the money received from a patient for services rendered by another which tended to influence Dr. Murray's objective evaluation of a patient as alleged in Counts Five (5), Ten (10), Fifteen (15),
Twenty-Three (23), Thirty-One (31), Thirty-Six (36), Forty-One (41), Forty-Six (46), and Fifty-Seven (57) of the Complaint.

65. Dr. Murray is **Guilty of Nine (9) Counts** of engaging in a plan, scheme, or method of operation established by Dr. Murray and William J. Leavitt, Jr., which resulted in the financial arrangement and conflict of interest Dr. Murray had in his treatment of his patients as alleged in Counts Six (6), Eleven (11), Sixteen (16), Twenty-Four (24), Thirty-Two (32), Thirty-Seven (37), Forty-Two (42), Forty-Seven (47), and Fifty-Eight (58) of the Complaint.

66. Dr. Murray is **Guilty of Thirteen (13) Counts** of failure to maintain medical records on patients to show what diagnosis, treatment, or care Dr. Murray was providing to the patients as alleged in Counts Seven (7), Twelve (12), Seventeen (17), Twenty (20), Twenty-Five (25), Twenty-Eight (28), Thirty-Three (33), Thirty-Eight (38), Forty-Three (43), Forty-Eight (48), Fifty-One (51), Fifty-Four (54) and Fifty-Nine (59) of the Complaint.

67. If any of the foregoing Conclusions of Law is more properly deemed a Finding of Fact, it may be so construed.

**ORDER**

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

RESPONDENT WILLIAM O. MURRAY, M.D.'s license to practice medicine in the state of Nevada is REVOKED.
RESPONDENT WILLIAM O. MURRAY, M.D., is fined a total of FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS ($5,000.00) on all Fifty-Nine (59) counts for which he has been found GUILTY.

RESPONDENT WILLIAM O. MURRAY, M.D., is ordered to pay to the Board the sum of NINETEEN THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED THIRTY-SEVEN DOLLARS AND TEN CENTS ($19,637.10) as and for the Board’s costs of investigation and prosecution of this matter.

DATED THIS 20th day of December, 1999.

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By: ARNE D. ROESECRANTZ, President
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