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PRESIDENT RHYNE:  Good morning. Today is Wednesday, April 23, 2008.

In accordance with Governor Easley's Executive Order Number 1, it is the duty of every Board Member to avoid both conflicts of interest and appearances of conflict.

Does any Board Member have any known conflicts of interest or appearance of conflict of interest with respect to any matter coming before the Board today? If so, please identify the conflict or appearance of conflict and refrain from any undue participation in the particular matters involved.

(NO RESPONSE)

Thank you.

******************************

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm Dr. Janelle Rhyne, President of the North Carolina Medical Board and I'll be presiding at this hearing.

We're here today for a hearing in the matter of Dr. Rashid Ali Buttar who is charged pursuant to the North Carolina General Statute 90-14(a)(6) and 90-14(a)(12) based upon allegations that he practiced below the acceptable standards of medical practice in the matter of which he treated Patients A through D and that he provided services
in a manner that exploited patients.

Board Members present to my left are Dr. Arthur McCulloch and to my right, Dr. William Walker.

Counsel for the Board is Mr. Marcus Jimison and Ms. Katherine Carpenter.

Counsel for Dr. Buttar is Mr. H. Edward Knox and Lisa G. Godfrey.

Mr. Jimison, are you ready to proceed?

MR. JIMISON: Yes, ma'am, Madam President.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And the preliminary matters, have we got that --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I don't believe there are preliminary matters at this point.

MS. GODFREY: Well, we have a Motion in Limine.

MR. JIMISON: I think we can deal with the Motion in Limine as we come to it during the hearing, but if you want to do it for now. I haven't seen the Motion in Limine.

MS. GODFREY: Okay. Well, I was just going to hand out copies of it.

MR. JIMISON: Oh, okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Oh, that's all right.

MR. JIMISON: Well, we don't have problems passing out copies.
MS. GODFREY: Madam President, this is a -- a Motion in Limine is a motion brought prior to the beginning of the hearing for a pre-hearing ruling on certain matters of evidence. And we believe that three of the witnesses that the Medical Board plans to call will be testifying primarily to hearsay. And attached to the motion are copies of the North Carolina Rules of Evidence that deal with hearsay.

As you may know, hearsay is an out-of-court statement used to prove the truth of the matter asserted. In our case, two of the complaining witnesses in this case never met -- or actually all -- none of the complaining witnesses in this case ever met Dr. Buttar.

The two that are listed here, Dr. Herman and Mr. Messina, everything they know about Dr. Buttar and his treatment they know through conversation with other people and that is why we bring the motion to have anything that they would have to testify to, that they do not have direct personal knowledge of, not be allowed to be heard by the Board.

In the case of Dr. Herman, the Board has subpoenaed a witness, Ms. Marie Church, who does have personal knowledge and we -- we contend whatever evidence she has to give is a better quality of evidence and not hearsay evidence.
With regard to Mr. Messina, he is a witness that has never
been to North Carolina to our knowledge. He lives in Los
Angeles and everything he knows about Dr. Buttar he learned
either from his aunt who is deceased or his mother who
lives in Pennsylvania and that he has no direct personal
knowledge of anything with regard to Dr. Buttar's
practices. And anything that he would have to testify
to, particularly on that witness, we say would be hearsay.
And so I just wanted to preview that from the Board because
we will be objecting to the testimony of these witnesses
and I just wanted to give you a heads-up, so to speak,
as to why and as to why we feel the hearsay evidence is
inappropriate.

I have the law for you and I'm not going to belabor the
point. I'm not asking you necessarily to exclude or
include these witnesses at this point, but what I do want
to do is highlight for you the reasons we will be -- be
objecting to their testimony in hopes that we can move
this along.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you, Ms. Godfrey.
Did you want to respond to that, Mr. Jimison?

MR. JIMISON: Yes. And, you know, per our standard
practice, if it's okay with the Board President I'll remain
seated, but I'll stand if you like.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No, please do remain seated at this time for all counsel.

MS. GODFREY: Okay, but I'm used to standing.

MR. JIMISON: There -- there are -- I don't want to take but just a few moments. But the most important thing Ms. Godfrey says that hearsay is defined as an out-of-court statement as being asserted for the truth of the matter asserted. If it is being asserted for some other reason, such as corroboration or impeachment or -- or basically just to show knowledge, it is not being asserted for the truth of the matter.

There is a whole slew of exceptions to the hearsay rule that would cover certain things. And, frankly, I think when we get to these certain -- when we get to certain questions, you know, you'll find out what's the purpose of the question and -- and then you can make a decision. I don't think we need to make a decision right now, but there are exceptions. One of which is a dying declaration. Statements made by people who are deceased, who are dying. And as the Board's witnesses will show, these people were dying, that -- you know, that's an exception -- not necessarily an exception to hearsay, it's defined as
non-hearsay.

So, you know, if it's not being asserted for the truth of the matter, if it's being asserted to corroborate what another witness has said, then it's asserted for purposes of corroboration. It's being done to show some -- you know, some flaw with the witness's testimony for impeachment purposes, it's defined as non-hearsay. So -- but I think it would be best if we just deal with those matters as they come out during the hearing and not right now preliminarily.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We will deal with that as they come up.

Now, we'll have the opening statements.

Mr. Jimison, would you like to make an opening statement?

MR. JIMISON: Yes, Madam President.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. JIMISON:

And for the purpose of, perhaps, Dr. Walker, because I know I've made this speech before for Dr. Rhyne and Dr. McCulloch, but the purpose of an opening statement, Dr. Walker, Members of the Board, is that it's basically showing a road map of what the evidence is going to show during the course of this hearing.

This is sort of like -- what I actually prefer analogizing
to is a story, an outline of a story. What you're going
to hear is a story of patients who are dying of cancer
and their experience with Dr. Buttar. And the purpose
of the opening statement is we basically provide you sort
of a sense of what the evidence is going to show.
There are four patients, A through D that the Board has
charged Dr. Buttar with. I'll be focusing mostly on just
the first three, Patients A, B and C, all who had cancer.
And there's also what we call the pattern of practice
witness, Patient E, who will be testifying as to certain
things that happened with her experience with Dr. Buttar
that would seem, you know, in the Board's theory of the
case to lend credence to what some of the other people
will be saying. So that's the purpose of an opening
statement and this is mine.
The Board's evidence will show the following: Patient A,
a young, beloved wife and mother. She is diagnosed with
cervical cancer, her cancer will spread, she is dying and
soon she will die.
Patient B is a young, beloved sister and aunt. She is
diagnosed with ovarian cancer. Her cancer will
metastasize and spread throughout her body, she is dying
and soon she will die.
Patient C, a young, beloved husband and father who was diagnosed with adrenal cell cancer. It will later spread to his liver and lungs. He too is dying and he too will soon die.

All three of these patients are holding on to life, tumors are spreading throughout their body, surgery, radiation, chemotherapy have all failed to halt the progression of this insidious disease. The question is not whether the cancer will kill them, the question is when.

In these darkest of hours, Patients A, B and C will search for some hope, some glimmer of hope to stave off the inevitable march of their disease. They will all find their way to Dr. Buttar. They came to him because of some of information somewhere that led them to believe that Dr. Buttar could do something about their cancer. They came with hope, they came with optimism, they came in desperation.

The evidence will show that Dr. Buttar, and many times his nurse practitioner, told these patients that they could help. They can treat them, help them fight their cancers, help them beat back their cancer. The evidence will show that this was nothing more than an empty sales pitch.

What Dr. Buttar sold these five patients, these dying moms,
sisters, aunts, husbands and fathers, was false hope, hope that he knew to be false. The hope consisted of providing therapies that were not only not an indicator of cancer, but had no basis whatsoever in science or any evidence that it would be effective against cancer.

Patients A, B and C all had Stage IV metastatic cancer.

Cancer is somewhat of a misnomer as you may know. It is a single term that describes hundreds of thousands of different types of malignancies and diseases. Cancer is a disease with an energy in molecular biology that has baffled the leading scientists and researchers of the 20th and 21st Centuries. Billions of dollars going into research, thousands of the best and brightest minds dedicated to its eradication and yet despite significant strides made in the war against cancer, these many diseases with a single name still persists. It still persists robbing us of our loved ones, our parents, our children, our brothers and sisters.

The Board's evidence will show that despite the fact that cancer has baffled the world's best and brightest, Dr. Buttar and his nurse practitioner have the answers. The answer, hydrogen peroxide. But not just hydrogen
peroxide, the common household solution, but also therapy
such as ozone, intravenous vitamins and minerals, trigger
point injections, chelation therapy and hyperbaric
chambers.

These therapies are given to patients over the course of
an eight to ten hour day, five days a week for weeks on
end. And these therapies will beat back cancer that has
defied surgery, radiation, chemotherapy -- chemotherapy
and the latest experimental drugs. And they work -- and
they will work for all cancers, even though it can take
years of research dedicated to the development of a single
drug to fight a single cancer.

These therapies administered by Dr. Buttar's nurse
practitioner and nurses given eight hours a day, five days
a week for weeks on end work -- will work where the best
of modern medicine has failed or at least, according to
Dr. Buttar's nurse practitioner.

However, in reality, the Board's evidence will show that
these therapies will not fight cancer. They have no effect
on cancer whatsoever. None. They are not effective.
They are science or evidenced based therapies. They have
not been subjected or proven to work at any clinical trial.
They have not been found to have any effect singularly or in combination with any other therapies provided by Dr. Buttar on cancer. They are useless and ineffective.

The only real effect is to rob these dying patients of their precious remaining days and their precious resources.

Dr. John Peterson, a double ABMS board certified physician in oncology and hematology, will testify that the treatments that Dr. Buttar provides are not only useless and ineffective, they are nothing more than rank fraud. And the evidence will show that these fraudulent therapies have been enormously profitable to Dr. Buttar. Dr. Buttar's therapies are administered to patients while he's out of the office by his nurse practitioner and nurses because he is out of his office and quite frequently, costs in excess of $1,000 a day.

Patients A, B and C will all have paid in excess of tens of thousands of dollars to Dr. Buttar before they died. And when Patients B and C became disaffected with the care they received from Dr. Buttar and stopped paying him, Dr. Buttar turned over their accounts to collection agencies even after they died.

In the case of Patient C, Dr. Buttar will refer a $6,700
balance to a collection agency who in turn proceeded to
collect in excessive of $20,000 from Patient C's estate.

Dr. Buttar proceeded to collect in excess of $19,000 from
Patient B's estate.

The records of all five patients will show a distinct
pattern. Patients are not examined or followed by Dr.
Buttar. All five patients, not just the cancer patients,
were seen primarily in some instances exclusively by Dr.
Buttar's nurse practitioner.

Dr. Buttar would order numerous tests and lab work that
had no rational medical relationship to the patient's
cancer diagnosis. Many tests and labs that were ordered
by Dr. Buttar were never adequately justified, never linked
to the patient's diagnosis or clinical condition.

There is no evidence that any of the extensive tests and
lab work were used for treatment decisions. And despite
the fact that cancer is a heterogenous disease, Patients
A, B and C were treated with an indistinguishable arbitrary
protocol as if one size fits all.

Patient E is a pattern-in-practice patient. Patient E
is an eight-year-old school girl who is severely autistic.

Her mother contacted the Board after receiving a
solicitation from Dr. Buttar to support him in this matter.
Like the -- like the cancer patients, Patient E's mother came across information that Dr. Buttar could help her child's autism. And without ever seeing the doctor, without ever traveling to North Carolina, Patient E was sent a kit to -- to basically self-administer a chelation therapy on her own daughter. And when things started going -- deteriorating for Patient E, Patient E's only interaction with Dr. Buttar was through his nurse practitioner or other staff members in his office.

And the nurse practitioner who essentially, from the medical records, as you will see, made all decisions about the treatment and diagnosis of this child's autism across state lines without personally seeing the patient, has no formal training in autism or oncology, much like Dr. Buttar who does not have any formal training in oncology or autism.

Yet, nonetheless, they convinced Patient E's mother to take the child off of her medication so that he can apply a transdermal chelation cream on the child. A cream, not so coincidentally, that is developed and invented and sold directly by Dr. Buttar to his patients.
The mother did as instructed and took her daughter off her medication and applied Dr. Buttar's transdermal chelation cream. Her daughter began to deteriorate. The child began to have violent tantrums. She couldn't leave the house or attend school. During the weeks and months as the child deteriorated, Dr. Buttar never followed the child.

And when the mother did not get a satisfactory response to her concerns, she called the office, made an appointment to see Dr. Buttar and drove her family to North Carolina. However, when she got to North Carolina, she did not see Dr. Buttar, only the nurse practitioner.

And the result of that meeting was that the nurse practitioner attempted to convince the patient -- the patient's mother that the child needed to be converted to a more aggressive intravenous form of chelation therapy. The evidence will show that Patient E's situation mirrors that of the other patients. Little or no physician involvement with the patient. Patients are seen primarily, if not exclusively, by the nurse practitioner. The patients have serious illnesses and Dr. Buttar and his nurse practitioner have no formal training in those illnesses.
The patients are prescribed expensive treatments that come straight out of their pocket because insurance does not pay for the treatments. The treatments are arbitrary, one size fits all. They have no basis or evidence of science. The therapies are ineffective and not been subjected to clinical trials and are potentially unsafe. Patients are deprived of their remaining days and significant amounts of money before they tragically and inevitably pass away. And at least in the cases of two patients, after they passed away, Dr. Buttar stays a presence in their life of their surviving loved ones by seeking to collect thousands of dollars from their estates through collection agencies.

In sum, the Board's evidence will show that Dr. Buttar prays on people in the darkest hours at a time when they are most desperate. He provides therapies to dying patients that have not been shown to be effective and charges thousands of dollars a day for what he knows will not work and he does this with a North Carolina medical license hanging on his wall.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Knox or Ms. Godfrey, would you like to make an opening statement?
OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. KNOX:

Mark Twain once said that the stories of my death are grossly exaggerated. If that was the evidence, I will tell you, it's been embellished. It looks like as you indicated yesterday you would take ten minutes to make this argument and that's been over extended.

I do want to say this to the Board. Dr. Buttar is here with me this morning. He is a bright, intellectual, capable, good doctor. He loves his patients. He believes in the fact that we don't have to give up on everybody because traditionally they say it's time to give up. He is a strong person who desires to be as innovative as he can to help people with their immune system as alternative methods. He believes strongly in the freedom of choice for people to have this type treatment. He's lectured across the world. He's testified before the United States Congress. He's published many articles and wrote books. He's a leading authority on autism and treating the immune system.

As a side note, in 2003 Dr. Buttar, President of the North Carolina Alternative Society, went before the legislature to talk about changes and what an integrative doctor was.
Notwithstanding that Mr. Buttar is not going to testify -- he will testify less than three weeks later he received a report from this Board saying, come to Raleigh and talk to us about your practice. That would have been fine, but at the bottom of this, though, it says you are advised of your Miranda rights and anything you tell us might be used against you.

Now, he's going on. Dr. Buttar is here to talk about these three cases and this has been a moving target. Mrs. XXXXXX (Mother of Patient E) was added in the last eight to ten days.

MR. JIMISON: Objection. At this point I'd like to just remind everyone that we refer to patients as A, B, C, D or E.

MR. KNOX: She is not a patient.

MR. JIMISON: Well --

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Let's still use --

MR. KNOX: Okay. I understand.

The burden of proof in this case is not on Dr. Buttar. He doesn't have to say a word. The burden is on Mr. Jimison to prove to you that Dr. Buttar has failed to follow the standards of the alternative doctor, not an oncologist.
as their expert is.
Their expert has testified there's been no harm to any of these patients, physical harm. So the test for you is going to be the efficacy of this treatment, does it have merit.
The North Carolina General Statutes specifically says -- it defines integrative medicine as a diagnostic or therapeutic treatment that may not be considered a conventionally accepted medical treatment and that a licensed physician, in the physician's professional opinion, believes -- the word believes -- may be a potential benefit to the patient, so long as the treatment poses no greater risk of harm to the patient than the comparable conventional treatments.
As I indicated, the expert says there's been no physical harm. So the test for you is going to be what is the standard of an integrative doctor.
Now, there were four cases, Patient A, B, C and D. These patients are cancer patient and Patient D was a person treated for heavy metal toxicity who came to Dr. Buttar as a latter patient with a pre-diagnosis of lead toxins and was asked to be treated with chelation therapy. Dr. Buttar did not see her. She only took chelation
therapy. But the end result is, she was upset about her bill and I won't go into the circumstances of the bill, but that's what brought her charges to the Board.

Now, after I took her deposition, they -- they sort of dismissed her as a part of this case and reached out to get one more person, Patient E, to help build up the case.

This case is not about the patient. It's not about the patient's complaint. It's about beneficiaries who are unhappy that they got bills and were taking money out of this estate.

Dr. Buttar will offer three doctors, alternative doctors.

And one doctor, Dr. Ripoll, who is a neurologist/oncologist, an alternative medicine doctor, will testify that he met the standard of care in the treatment of these patients.

The timing of the treatment and acting on the complaints is highly important for you to consider. For example, Patient A was last treated in June of '06. Neither the patient nor her daughter who went with her to every visit complained about the treatment by Dr. Buttar.

The daughter coincidentally works for Dr. Herman who is a complaining witness who never ever told her employee, by the way, I'm going to file some complaint to the Medical
Board. She's down the hall and never asked her about the treatments and then called her as a witness when she doesn't want to be involved. The point I make is, in that instance, it's about people who objected outside of the patient or the daughter who was there.

Patient B is treated for her immune system. She was an ovarian cancer patient. She was only treated about three weeks by Dr. Buttar and she was discharged for non-compliance.

Now, the Board's attorney wants to use not what she said about the treatment rendered by the doctor, but they want to use a heir, a nephew who is the sole heir of Patient B's estate who never saw Patient B during the treatment.

Patient B died five months later after the treatment. And the boyfriend who came with her to every treatment, they never sought him out as a witness, but he and Patient B never complained to Dr. Buttar.

Patient C is an adrenal cancer patient who had undergone extensive surgery and took 16 of 28 radiation treatments in February of '04, over four years ago. The sole complainant is his wife, the sole beneficiary of his estate.

Now, when this patient was going to Dr. Buttar, he paid
and every one of these pages signed -- patients signed a consent. We don't get insurance, that's between you, we'll keep our family doctor involved. Dr. Buttar does not grant -- guarantee anything about the therapy and they all signed written consents acquiescing that they knew exactly what they were doing.

Now, Patient C's wife, after he left Dr. Buttar, had went to Mexico for further alternative treatment, called up and canceled a $5700 check which the patient had written to Dr. Buttar and which he had not complained about. The patient stopped treatment with Dr. Buttar in June of '04, almost four years.

We think he was as happy a patient -- he went from being nauseated and vomited and fatigued, unable to do anything after the radiation, and Dr. Buttar built him up where he was walking two miles a day, going to his games and his vitality improved. And we say that the therapies was what helped him.

The wife incidentally is complaining about the bill and she never drove up to see this doctor. She did not go to the radiation treatments and she did not go to Mexico even though she admitted that there was nothing to keep her from doing that. It's all about the money that may
have come out of the estate.

Now, someone once said a river never rises higher than the street. And interesting enough, the Board employed Dr. Peterson in October of 2007 to review the Board cases. He's a traditional hematologist and oncologist. And that may be when I say traditional -- a pretty fair representation because Dr. Peterson believes that if you don't use surgery, you don't do chemotherapy or radiation, the next step is to take pain medication and get palliative care and give up. Dr. Buttar does not believe you give up.

Dr. Peterson will testify and has testified in his deposition that he's not able to define what an integrative doctor is according to this statute. He will testify that the standard that he applies is that of an oncologist. We say that is not the test. The test is, was the treatment in accordance with an integrative doctor.

Not only has there been this two to four year delay to proceed on the charges, they all are subject to a number of visits by the staff to Dr. Buttar's office and every time he has cooperated with them. I don't know how many times a doctor could anticipate somebody coming in to their office from the Medical Board.
Dr. Peterson billed that he took hours to review approximately a thousand pages. He said he wasn't sure why he was called, but he went through them and wrote down some information. We think his -- for lack of understanding about what his role was going to be and lack of time to review -- he was at -- his investigation and his opinions were not well thought out.

For example, he said Patient D was treated with chelation therapy for constipation. We took Patient D's deposition. She admitted she came with a lead diagnosis and she asked to be treated with chelation therapy. No one ever treated her for constipation, but somehow that was his diagnosis of what Dr. Buttar did.

In Patient C, he indicated that Dr. Buttar had no contact with the patient. The records are full of information signed by Dr. Buttar where he did the physical at times that he gave his patient IRRs. He gave every one of these cancer patients an IRR injection, three times, so he did see the patient.

Dr. Buttar had no notes of a thousand pages that he wrote or if he did, he tossed them away.

MS. GODFREY: Dr. Peterson.

MR. KNOX: -- Dr. Peterson.
The point I make is, this is a serious matter that he's been asked to investigate and to write a report. I'm going to ask you to do this, you're all doctors and I'm sure good doctors. I'm going to ask you to listen to this evidence. The Board has the burden of proving to you that he's failed to follow an alternative standard of care.

And then I want you to listen as they bring forth the expert and the information. I want you to weigh their credibility on what the people say and what is their motive for this. Why didn't it come earlier? Why this wasn't part of -- not 2004, 2005, 2006, but in 2007?

The lawyers change medical science they got. And doctors are people that promulgate and bring about change and that's why we're here. We have a doctor that believes you go look ahead. But you can't always just say, go home and die. Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right. Now, we're ready to hear the evidence. Mr. Jimison, I'll call on you to present the evidence.

MR. JIMISON: Thank you, Madam President, and just for counsel, and typically the practice before the Medical Board with these quality of care cases are just to go ahead
and stipulate into the record the medical records and at
this point I'd like to just go ahead and stipulate into
evidence the medical records of Patients A through E.

MS. GODFREY: Well, we're going to object to the medical
records of Patient E. I'm sorry, I keep getting up, it's
just a force of habit. I have to do that in court.

Patient E is not in the complaining charges. The complaint
came in, I think, about a month ago. The Medical Board
has not -- not investigated it. There are no formal
charges involving Patient E and we would object to the
wholesale consideration of those records in this
proceeding.

If the Board wants to bring a formal complaint about Patient
E, that's fine. If there are particular portions of the
records that might be relevant to the testimony of Patient
E's mother, that would be fine. But the wholesale
admission of the patient in these records, I think is
inappropriate at this time.

MR. JIMISON: This matter was as you may recall, Dr. Rhyne,
was in -- was addressed in a pre-hearing conference. You
allowed her as a pattern to practice witness. The medical
records as the Board is very familiar with and is -- is
the best evidence of what's happened with that patient.
You're not precluded from introducing medical records or patient testimony just because it's not part of the charges if it's part of the pattern to practice. Ms. Godfrey has not cited any Rules of Evidence or any law that would prohibit you from considering the medical records when Patient E testifies if she's testifying as part of the pattern of practice.

So, therefore, it's the best evidence. She's going to be talking about the care that her daughter received and the best evidence of the care that her daughter received, that this Board has historically and traditionally been aware of, is part of the medical records. Many times when patients testify on behalf of the doctor, we ask that they bring their medical records in. So it's not uncommon and there is no rule of evidence or statute that would prevent the Board from considering it, nor did Ms. Godfrey cite one.

MS. GODFREY: Since the rule isn't whether or not they are at all relevant, there's no expert witnesses to examine the records and give any conclusion. It's just simply the mother has to testify about whether she heard --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I think we will allow the records.
MR. JIMISON: And also without objection, but we can do it during the hearing, but I would like to amend and stipulate into evidence Exhibit 7 through 11. Those are basically just CDs about documents I received from Dr. Buttar's office and I would like to go ahead and refer 7 and 11 through -- into evidence.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry.

MR. JIMISON: Exhibit 7 through 11, the Board's Exhibit 7 through 11.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Exhibits 7 through 11?

MS. GODFREY: Seven.

MR. JIMISON: Do you have the list?

MS. GODFREY: I have those, yes.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Is that one of our notebooks?

MR. JIMISON: This one.

MS. GODFREY: The second notebook.

MR. JIMISON: In the second notebook.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: In the second one.

MS. GODFREY: It's a little smaller.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. They will be admitted.

MR. JIMISON: And I will deal with Number 6 when we call Dr. Peterson.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Six.
MR. JIMISON: Okay. At this --

MS. GODFREY: You got one for me. Do I need it?

MR. KNOX: Okay. I'm sorry. We're okay.

MS. GODFREY: I just wanted to keep school.

MR. JIMISON: We would now like to call Stephanie Kenny to the stand.

WHEREUPON,

STEPHANIE KENNY,

being first duly sworn,

was examined and testified

as follows:

MR. JIMISON: Actually, before we get started, Dr. Rhyne, may Ms. Godfrey and I consult?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Sure.

(BENCH CONFERENCE OFF THE RECORD)

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

QWill you introduce yourself to the Medical Board.

AMY name is Stephanie Kenny.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Can you turn on the microphone.

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry and I apologize, but if you're sitting that close to her and you're that soft, I'm not going to
ever hear you. Do you have your microphone on?

MR. JIMISON: I have my microphone on.

MR. KNOX: Okay.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Ms. Kenny, do you mind testifying publicly about this matter?

ANo.

QOkay. So I'll refer to you as Ms. Kenny when we refer to the Patient C.

Ms. Kenny, where do you live?

AMy address?

QUh-huh (yes).

A2801 Redfield Drive in Charlotte.

QAnd could you describe your family to us?

AI have three children.

QWho are they? Well, you can just give me their first names and ages or gender.

AWhen I agreed to do -- to go public, I didn't agree to involve --

QOkay. Do you have boys?

AI have two sons and a daughter.

QOkay. And how old are they?

A17, 16 and 8.

QOkay. Were you married?
AYes.

QAnd were you married to Patient C?
AYes.

QAnd how long were you married?
ASEventeen plus years.

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry, I'm still having trouble hearing you.

WITNESS: Seventeen years.

MS. GODFREY: We're all having trouble hearing her.

MR. JIMISON: If you could kind of pull up a little closer to the mike. All right. Maybe that will help.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) At some point was your husband diagnosed with cancer?
AYes.

QAnd tell me about when you originally learned about your husband's cancer diagnosis.
AIt was in September of '03.

QAnd what type of cancer was it?
AAAdrenal.

QAnd how old was your husband when he was first diagnosed with cancer?
AForty-two.

QForty-two?
Forty-two, yes, sir.

And what happened after he was diagnosed with adrenal cancer?

Then came a plan for surgery and after the surgery, radiation.

So he had the surgery?

He did.

He started radiation?

Yes.

Did he finish the radiation?

No, he did not.

And why not?

He just couldn't tolerate it.

And what did your husband do after that?

He --

What happened after he stopped the radiation?

He appeared to be doing well. I mean, it took him a while to get over it, but then he -- he was doing better and he was back to work full-time. He looked much better and had the energy, but then it was rediscovered in another scan in February of '04.

February of '04?

Yes.

And what happened after that?

Well, at that point, the scan showed a spinal tumor and a speck
in the lung, but his oncologist -- his oncologist said that operating fails at that point. He just encouraged him to look at quality of life.

Q And so the -- would it be fair to say his cancer was metastatic?
A Yes, at that point, yes, it was.

Q And it spread through the liver and his lungs? And your husband's oncologist did not -- did not recommend further surgery?
A No.

Q Did he recommend further chemotherapy or radiation?
A No.

Q And what did your husband do after he basically had that conversation with his oncologist?
A He didn't want them to biopsy it and went to alternative care.

Q And did he ever meet -- did he ever decide to go to Dr. Buttar?
A He did.

Q And how did he hear of Dr. Buttar?
A Just through research. He was looking at this at night and just researching on-line and he seen him in some article.

Q Okay. And did he -- did he ever have a chance to meet Dr. Buttar, your husband?
A Prior to becoming a patient?

Q Yeah. Well, I mean, did he ever go see Dr. Buttar at his office?
AYes. I'm sorry about that.

QWere you there?

AI was.

QOkay. Was that the first meeting?

AIt was.

QAnd describe that meeting that you were present at.

AWell, we brought all his records. He said he was not concerned with the type of cancer, that he had a 100 percent success rate, that he would be able to turn his body chemistry around to fight the cancer, so it didn't matter what kind it was.

QOkay. And did -- did Dr. Buttar make any representations about how successful his therapy would be?

MR. KNOX: Objection, asked and answered. She just answered.

QAgain --

AHe did give -- he said that he had a 100 percent success rate.

QHow did you take that? How did you personally take that?

ATo mean that he had a 100 percent cure rate.

QAnd -- and after that meeting, what did you and your husband decide to do?

AHe chose to become a patient as opposed to -- (inaudible).

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Excuse me. Chose to go where? We
couldn't hear.

MR. JIMISON: Yeah, I'm having a hard time hearing her.

Please speak up a little louder.

WITNESS: He chose to continue alternative care with Dr. Buttar as opposed to going to the Issles Clinic in Mexico at that time.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) The treatments were -- did the treatments, were they explained to you by Dr. Buttar during the first meeting what he would do?

ANot in great detail. He talked about the nutritional aspect and the supplements he would have to take, the changes in diet and he said that, you know, ozone and that kind of thing, but it weren't discussed in detail.

QOkay. And when did your husband start going for treatments?

AI think it was sometime in late February or early March.

QAll right. Okay. And how long would the treatments last per day?

AAll day, just like a job.

QDescribe that day. When did your husband leave the house?

AWell, he would leave between 7 and 7:30, I believe it was, and it was about a 45 minute drive.

QOkay. And when would -- sorry. And when would he return home
at night?

A About 6.

Q About 6:00?

A Uh-huh (yes).

Q So he was there from basically 8:00 to 5:00?

A Yes.

Q Five days a week?

A Right.

Q And what was his therapy, to your knowledge?

A Ozone treatments, sauna treatments -- (inaudible) -- some medication. There were two different base lines that you made -- (inaudible).

Q And did your husband, did he talk about IV therapies that he got?

A Yes, chelations all the time.

Q And so he would go to these therapies for eight hours a day?

A Right.

Q Five days a week?

Q Right.

Q And how -- how many weeks did he do it?

A Sixteen.

Q Sixteen weeks?

A Right.
Q: Was 16 weeks originally discussed between you and Dr. Buttar and your husband?

MR. KNOX: Objection. I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry, did you object?

MR. KNOX: No, I withdraw it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Withdrew it.

A: It was supposed to be a six week plan when Jeff started there.

Q: Okay. So after the sixth week he continued until the sixteenth week?

A: Right.

Q: Are you familiar with how much it costs per day for the treatments?

A: No.

Q: Okay. I'd like to turn your attention to the first big binder in your notebook. And if you can turn to --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: This is the big notebook?

MR. JIMISON: Yeah. The thick -- thick one, the big thick one.

MS. GODFREY: Is it two?

Q: Okay. If you can turn to page 265.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Is that Tab 2, page 265?

MR. JIMISON: Yes, ma'am. Tab 2, page 265.

Q: (By Mr. Jimison) I wanted you to look at just the entry on
the left which says June 1st. Do you see that?

AYes.

QAnd there's several entries for June 1st until you get to June 11th, correct?

AYes.

QOkay. And then it actually starts back at June 2nd. But just -- just focusing on June 1st, we'll focus for June 1st, there is a list of services your husband received from Dr. Buttar, correct?

AYeah.

QAnd the first one is a therapeutic or diagnostic injection. And then there's another therapeutic or diagnostic injection. And then there are one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, ten charges for IV infusion therapies.

ARight.

QAnd each infusion therapy and it's followed by $125, $70 and then the next one will be 125 and 70 and 125 and 70 and so on. Then there's a comprehensive metabolic panel that was taken, a lipid panel that was taken. Something called iron or iron binding capacity was given, biofeedback training by any modality for $150. Something called an ACP 3 that cost $100, black walnut $42, PBIB that cost
$100, chocolate protein powder that charge is $76. And then there's a thing called an adjustment for 365. And then there's basically a check payment for $1400, correct?

A Right.

Q And if you just take time going back to page 259 all the way through page 267, you will see -- did you go to page 259?

A Yeah.

Q And if you can just sort of -- sort of skim, you know, quickly through page 267, there's basically many of the same entries and charges beginning from April 26th through June 11th. And do you see the balance at the end on page 267?

A Yes.

Q And how much is that?

A $25,237.41.

QWhen your husband first showed up to Dr. Buttar, what was his emotional state?

A He was glad to find a cure because --

QCould you speak into the --

A He wanted to find a cure -- (inaudible).

QOkay. Was he seeking hard with the -- I mean, figuratively seeking some sort of alternative?

A Yes.

Q Was he desperate?
MR. KNOX: Objection.

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection to the meaning of --

MR. KNOX: I mean, she's described him as he didn't want
to give up, but he's now characterizing --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Object. Yeah, that's sustained.

MR. JIMISON: I'll rephrase.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Characterize to the degree of how he didn't
want to give up.

AHe had a wife and three children at home, he had a lot to live
for and he was -- (inaudible).

QOkay. And so when he was away from the home, was he spending
time with his children?

AHe was home every day. He was home in the evening.

QOkay. So he could only see his children during the night?

ACorrect.

QAnd did you ever see any improvement in your husband's condition
during the time he was with Dr. Buttar?

ANo, I did not. He just grew worse quickly.

QAnd describe him during this four month period or this several
month period.

AHe lost weight, just physically looked ill or was physically
ill and that just perpetuated.

QAt some point did your husband stop seeing Dr. Buttar?
AHe did, yes.

QAnd why was that?

AWell, he had -- Dr. Buttar thought he was better and ordered a CAT scan because the -- it was very apparent that he was not getting better even though the test results said that he was and the cancer was breaking up. And, anyway, that was when he left. That was his last day.

MR. KNOX: I object to what Dr. Buttar says she said. She was not there.

QDid --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: If she -- your objection is?

MR. KNOX: Yes. If she wasn't there that's hearsay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah, it's hearsay.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) At some point, did you ever stop paying Dr. Buttar for his treatments?

AI canceled -- on Jeff's last day, I canceled the last payment.

QAnd why did you do that?

AI did that when I read the results from the CAT scan.

QAnd what were the results of his CAT scan?

AThat it had spread to the other side of his liver and it was completely all over the lungs. And my husband came home telling me that Dr. Buttar told him there was nothing he --

MR. KNOX: Objection.
Q: Go ahead. And your husband came home and you had a conversation with your husband?

A: Yes.

Q: And -- and did your husband continue on with his treatment?

A: Did he want to continue to?

Q: With Dr. Buttar?

A: No. Not after seeing the report, no.

Q: Okay. And so after your husband was getting treatments from Dr. Buttar, the therapies that are mentioned in the medical records which are in evidence, the hydrogen peroxide, the ozone chelation therapies --

A: Right.

Q: -- the biofeedback, the vitamins, his cancer continued to spread --

A: Correct.

Q: -- according to that CAT scan?

A: Correct.

Q: And at some point he stopped seeing Dr. Buttar and you canceled a check. And what happened to that -- how did Dr. Buttar's office respond to you canceling the check?

A: They returned -- well, they sent me a few bills and they went up in increments and then it was turned over to a collection agency.
Q: And when did your husband pass away?
A: September 6th of '04.

Q: Approximately two or three months after seeing Dr. Buttar?
A: Right.

Q: And prior to him passing away, what did he do?
A: He went to Mexico to the Issles Clinic.

Q: Did he go to Mexico?
A: He did, yeah.

Q: Why did he go to Mexico?
A: For further treatment.

Q: And what kind of treatments did he receive in Mexico?
A: Their's was also alternative care.

Q: And describe the day -- did any of that work in Mexico?
A: Well, I don't --

MR. KNOX: Well, objection.

MR. JIMISON: Well, to her opinion, she can give her opinion about whether she thinks it worked. It's well within a lay opinion.

MR. KNOX: Well, objection. She's not a doctor, she can say what observation she may --

MR. JIMISON: Lay people can --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: She can -- she can give her observation.

MR. JIMISON: Her observation.
Q (By Mr. Jimison) Did -- did the treatments in Mexico seem to be working on your husband --

MR. KNOX: Objection.

Q-- from your observations of your husband?

A He came home looking better, but obviously he passed away anyway.

MR. KNOX: Withdrawn.

Q How soon did he die after coming back from Mexico?

A He came back from Mexico the middle of July.

Q Okay. And within a month and a half he had died?

A Right.

Q Now, describe that day when your husband died.

A Well, earlier in the day he had his family, he was with our children and myself and he woke me up I think about 2 a.m. that morning saying that he didn't feel well and asked me to call the ambulance. He looked gray and was sweating. So, anyway, we went to the hospital and they wanted to transfer him downtown to -- (inaudible) -- and he just never got that far even.

Q And how has this experience with you, your husband and Dr. Buttar affected you?

A It makes me very angry that he could do this. I understand that alternative medicine doesn't cure everything, but
I think he needs to be honest with his patients, that -- that particularly where a scan should have been done and he should have been told honestly that it had spread. And to tell a patient that there's nothing conclusion in the radiologist report where the radiologist said that it spread everywhere and to continue with the therapy and we'll talk then. It's just criminal.

MR. KNOX: Well, objection.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry.

MR. KNOX: I objected to her classification of what the -- (inaudible).

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Sustained. We'll disregard that.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Was your husband still being followed by an oncologist when he was being seen by Dr. Buttar?

AHe was seeing him before and after Dr. Levine.

QOkay. And did your oncologist give your husband a life expectancy when -- when -- when the cancer spread?

MR. KNOX: Objection. I mean, he's not here.

MR. JIMISON: She knows --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Objection sustained.

MR. JIMISON: But if she knows, I mean, we're treating family, she -- she would have known her husband's life expectancy.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: You can -- you can -- unless you were there, you cannot. It's hearsay.

WITNESS: If I heard the doctor say anything?

MR. JIMISON: Okay. I'll withdraw it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. Let us know if you heard the doctor say anything.

WITNESS: I did. He said it --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You were present?

WITNESS: I was present, yes. And that was a year.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) He give him a year?

A Right.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

Ms. Godfrey or Mr. Knox, do you want to cross-examine?

MR. KNOX: One of us will.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

Q Ms. Kenny, as I understand it, you went with your husband to the first visit.

A Right.

Q Would you describe Dr. Buttar's office?

A It's just a lot of little rooms on the hallway.

Q What does the physical structure of the office appear like?

A Is it a one-story or two-story or three-story.
A: It is a one-story strip mall.

Q: One-story what?

A: Strip mall.

Q: So he was in a strip mall?

A: That's what I would call it. It wasn't an office complex or --

Q: And where was he located?

A: Cornelius on Torrance Chapel Road, I believe.

Q: You believe it was? Whereabouts in Cornelius?

A: I don't have the address for you because it's been too long.

Q: How did you get there?

A: My husband drove.

Q: And what roads did you take from Matthews?

A: 485 to the interstate.

Q: 485?

A: Yes.

Q: What interstate? Would you take 85?

A: I don't know. I was not driving.

Q: You remember I took your deposition a while back?

A: Yes.

Q: Correct? So I'll be asking you some questions. You were living at home with your husband at the time he became ill?
AYes.

QAnd he was under the treatment of a doctor -- not family physician -- who was the other one?

AHis oncologist?

AYes.

QDr. Levine.

QDr. Levine. So Dr. Levine was treating him. Now, he was treated with radiation therapy, correct?

AYes.

QAnd he went through some 16 of 28 injected radiation therapy treatments and he got deathly ill, didn't he?

AIt made him very nauseous.

QAnd he was throwing up, he lost weight, he stayed in the house most of the time, am I correct?

AYes.

QAnd you all -- he wanted to go see Dr. Buttar and you didn't want him to go to that office, did you?

AI just didn't want him just to decide on Dr. Buttar -- (inaudible) -- I wanted him to -- (inaudible).

QYou preferred that he go to Mexico, did you? Or where -- where did you prefer?

AI didn't have a preference. I didn't know about Dr. Buttar at all. I didn't know about -- (inaudible) -- heard of
it.

Q: And when you -- when you say that Dr. Buttar indicated that he would be cured as you said in your initial visit, do you remember -- you identified for me some signatures of your husband on some documents; is that correct?

A: Yes.

Q: And we went over those documents very carefully about what it was that Dr. Buttar could do, correct?

A: Uh-huh (yes).

MS. GODFREY: Maybe at this point, can we hand the documents out? We've got -- this is Buttar's Exhibit 17 and we have books for the Medical Board and I've given the book to Marcus so that you can all follow along.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: We can mark it. You can give that to Ed. And I've got one for you. Here you go.

Q: (By Mr. Knox) Have you had a chance to read that, ma'am?

A: Correct.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Knox, can you tell us where you are?

MS. GODFREY: Exhibit Number 17.

Q: (By Mr. Knox) It's called Patient Information and Registration form. You see it?

A: Yes, sir.
MS. GODFREY: And the redaction is not -- on the original

to be removed, if she wants to check on those for the
signature.

Q(By Mr. Knox) You notice at the bottom, the signature, but
when we took your deposition you indicated you all went
about in February and that he signed this Patient
Information form, correct?

AYes.

QAnd so you're sure you were there when it was signed, correct?

AI was with him on this first treatment -- not his first
treatment, but I was with him on the first visit in
Dr. Buttar's office, whether this was signed at that time,
I do not know.

QOkay. Well, actually he had called about the financial policy
ahead of time, hadn't he?

AHe did get information on the --

QAnd they had explained to him the financial policy, if you
come to our clinic you'll have to pay cash because insurance
doesn't apply as a rule even though I think some insurance
did apply, didn't it?

AThere were certain things that they --

QSo if you look at the bottom of this: "I understand that the
safety and efficacy of many such therapies have not been
established with controlled studies. Specifically, no
claim to cure cancer with these therapies has been made
to me and Dr. Buttar will not be providing hospital care
or emergency care for me in this clinic and the therapies
received will compliment the care I receive from my primary
care physician and will not replace them."
Correct? That's what it says, doesn't it?
A It does.
Q So when you say -- there's nothing in that documentation that
your husband signed about 100 percent cure, is there?
A No.
Q Not a word. Now, in addition to that and I'll ask you to go
next to the financial policy and I believe you identified
that and that should be the one right behind it. You see
that? I think it's Number 18.
And this is the financial policy that I assume you were
there and your husband signed this, correct?
A Yes.
Q I mean you identified his signature at the deposition?
A Yes, I did.
Q And that specifically says and talks about the fact that
insurance will not apply, so you both were aware of that?
A Yes.
Q: And you knew you were on a cash basis or a credit card basis, correct?
A: Correct.
Q: And your husband paid for every visit timely as he got the treatment, am I correct?
A: Yes.
Q: And after he paid for that sometime subsequently, I believe he had gone to Mexico and you decided that you would cancel this $6700 check that he personally wrote?
A: No. I canceled that check on the last day that he saw Dr. Buttar.
Q: So you called after that to cancel the check that your husband had written, correct?
A: When he got home that day, yes.
Q: And you had never been, after you went the first time, back to Dr. Buttar's clinic to watch any of the treatments or talk to the doctor or to any of the nurses, am I correct?
A: I only went the first time.
Q: Yeah. And your husband brought home lab results and whatever with him?
A: Yes.
Q: Now, at the same time Dr. Levine had been treating him with Procrit; is that correct, for iron deficiency?
AI don't know. He received a shot at the oncologist's office
--(inaudible) -- repeatedly --(inaudible) -- at that time.
QI'm sorry, I didn't hear you.
AHe repeatedly had that, but that was after he got --
QAnd that's what the instructions say, you should stay with
your regular doctor when you come in here to take these
alternative therapies, didn't it?
AThat's what we just said, yes.
QAnd you were not promised that the safety and efficacy of these
therapies had been established, correct?
AIf I had read that and signed that, I could say that. I'd
can only say whatever Dr. Buttar told us.
QIt says that Dr. Buttar would not treat private
hospitalizations.
ACorrect.
QRight.
AIt does say that.
QAnd it said the complimentary treatment that I receive will
assist in my medical care with my regular doctor.
AUh-huh (yes).
QAnd it says that returned checks will be subject to additional
collection fees, doesn't it?
AWhere am I at now?
Q: At the financial column. We went over this before and you testified --

A: Yes, it does.

Q: -- that you understood that, right?

A: Yes.

Q: So when you canceled payment of your husband's check that he wrote, you knew that there might be some collection fees, correct?

A: Yes.

Q: But it didn't make you happy you, did it? It upset you?

A: What upset me was the lie that he --

Q: So it upset you about the check and you wrote the North Carolina Medical Board, am I right?

A: I wrote to them in a complaint, yes.

Q: Yeah. And before you wrote to them, you told the staff people that you were going to turn him into the Medical Board because they were issuing it to a financial collection agency; is that correct?

A: No, that I have no recollection of.

Q: So you don't know whether you told the staff if y'all do this, I'm going to turn you into the Medical Board?

A: As I said in my deposition, I remember calling them about why the bill was then what it was as opposed to the $6700.
Q: But you don't remember when you threatened to send him to the Medical Board, do you?
A: No, no.
Q: Could that be true?
A: Could what be true?
Q: That you threatened him.
A: I think that would be really out of character for me.
Q: Beg your pardon?
A: I think that would be very out of character for me. I do not remember doing that.
Q: Let's go back. When your husband finished the radiation therapy, he had fatigue. We went over that in the health information, correct?
A: Yes.
Q: And he was not going out of the house?
A: Right.
Q: He had been vomiting from the radiation?
A: Correct.
Q: He did nothing with his children at that time?
A: Right.
Q: He was losing weight?
A: Yes.
Q: Now, when he went up to -- as a matter of fact, he lost about
59 pounds total, didn't he?

A Yes.

Q And when he went up to Dr. Buttar and started taking these therapies for his immune system, he went from that to feeling better; is that fair?

A He was feeling better before he went to Dr. Buttar because in February what they found on the scan, we were shocked.

Q Well, let me explain to you or ask you this question. He took his last therapy the first weeks of February and went to Dr. Buttar within a week or two, didn't he?

A You're talking about radiation?

Q Yes.

A That stopped in December.

Q Okay. Is it your testimony that he wasn't taking any radiation past December?

A Yes.

Q So when he went to Dr. Buttar, if he checked out the forms that he was -- he had fatigue, he was losing weight, he had no energy, was that his condition then?

A When he went to Dr. Buttar's office?

Q Yes. Do you remember going over the form about what he checked on his health -- his general health form? And we went over that to show that on a scale of 0 to 5, he had a 5
about fatigue? Am I right?
AI remember talking about it, I don't remember all that he said.
QSo when you say he was feeling very well and he wrote down
to Dr. Buttar the history, he wrote down that he wasn't
feeling so well, am I right?
AI'm saying that from the start to the radiation, yes, he lost
a ton of weight, he had massive surgery, had radiation,
he started feeling better. When he was seeing Dr. Buttar,
he was starting to do better.
QWell, I thought you said that he sold his business.
AHe did on impulse.
QAnd I thought you said that he did nothing. He said that he
was fatigued and was unable to do anything when he went
to see Dr. Buttar.
ANo, that's not true.
QAnd then he went --
AWhen he finished radiation, he was able to --
QI'm sorry. At any event, the therapy that he was taking, he
began to do a lot more than he had in the past, am I right?
I mean, he started walking, you said that. And he started
going to the kids' games, things of that nature?
AI felt like I'm being put into a corner here. After the
radiation he started to do better. He was shocked, we were all shocked -- (inaudible) -- but that's when we sought the alternative medicine. He was not on -- (inaudible) -- at that point.

Q Now, he died in September of '04; is that right?
A Yes.

Q After he left Dr. Buttar he went to Mexico to a Mexican hospital --
A Yes.

Q-- for alternative treatments.
A Yes.

Q Correct?
A Yes.

Q And you say that's after he realized that Dr. Buttar had not helped him, he went to the same type of procedure, an alternative procedure; is that correct?
A Yes. He wasn't -- when he started with Dr. Buttar.

Q And did he spend funds on that trip?
A Yes.

Q Flying?
A He used frequent flyer miles.

Q Okay. Did he stay in the hospital?
A He did.
Q Do you have any idea what that cost?
A About 25,000.

Q About 25,000. He was there how long?
A A month.

Q More than what Dr. Buttar charged when he turned him into the collection department?
A The $25,000?
Q Yes.
A I don't know.

Q How about what your oncologist charged for the radiation treatment? How much did that cost?
A I don't know.

Q You were subpoenaed to bring some documents with you today about what the costs were. Did you bring them?
A I did.

Q Where are they?
A Under my chair.

Q Have you looked at them to see what those costs are?
A No.

Q Do you know what the oncologist costs were, I'll take your word?
A No. I didn't look at that. I just -- the subpoena -- (inaudible).
Q And that was about $25,000.

Now, was your husband satisfied with the staff at Dr. Buttar's office? He liked them?

AYes, he like the staff.

Q After he came back from Mexico, Dr. Levine saw him again and recommended that he continue the therapy from Mexico, am I right?

AI believe so.

Q Now, prior to your filing this claim, you became -- there's no administration of your estate -- of your husband's estate --

ARight.

Q -- correct?

ARight.

Q He moved everything into your name, correct?

AI have nothing to my name. My husband's name was taken off -- (inaudible).

Q Well, you sold the house, didn't you?

AYes.

Q And you refinanced the houses?

AI just sold one of my properties, the first of this year.

Q The fact was, there was no estate for which any collection agency or Dr. Buttar could have collected any money?
ARight.

QNow, you did not go to Mexico?
AI did not.

QAnd you had a four-year-old that you had his parents available to help sit or other relatives that could have kept your baby?
AI have three children.
QSorry?
AI have three children.
QWell, I understand two of them are --
AMy oldest was -- my middle child is 18 and our youngest was four.
QBut you had family members you testified to that were available to stay with your children if you wanted to go to Mexico with your husband; is that true?
AWhat I testified to was that my husband and I decided it was best for me to stay home with the children.
QSo you went to one visit at Dr. Buttar's office, correct?
AYes.
QYou never went to Mexico, we agree with that. And finally you went to see Dr. Levine what, one time?
ANo, almost every time he went to Dr. Levine.
QAnd you never went to radiation, did you?
AI went for the original, but, no.

Q The staff members of Dr. Buttar came to your husband's funeral, didn't they?

AI remember Michelle being there.

Q And I believe you told me that you had only one conversation with Michelle and that was at the funeral and she called the house at one time.

AShe did call the house and she was at the funeral.

Q Now, you wrote that Michelle Reed had indicated that she left Dr. Buttar because of circumstances surrounding his practice. Did you write that in that information?

AUh-huh (yes).

Q Yes, you never really talked to her except that one time on the telephone at your husband's house or your house?

A At our house, yes.

Q And the truth of the matter is, you made up the fact that she allegedly left the practice of Dr. Buttar because you didn't know that she had come back and spent another two years with Dr. Buttar after your husband's death, did you?

AI didn't make anything up.

Q Okay. Did you make that statement, yes or no?

A What statement?

Q That Michelle had left Dr. Buttar's practice?
AThat's what I was told.

QSo that was hearsay from somebody else? But in these
        interrogatories by the investigative officer you told him
        that you had talked to Michelle Reed and Michelle Reed
told you that, right?

AMichelle had called the house and I heard that Michelle talked
to Jerry Messina, Michelle talked to a lawyer that Jerry
had spoken to and I can't tell you exactly which
        conversation that came up and it was told to me.

QMichele Reed never told you that, that's true, isn't it?
AI can't tell you whether it's true or not.

QYou don't remember? Is that your testimony?
AI don't know if she told Jeff, I don't know if she said that
to me on the phone, I don't know if she told it to Jerry.

QWhen your husband was in -- over in Mexico, did you know that
he was e-mailing Dr. Buttar almost -- his staff almost
daily?

ANo.

QDo you know that they were e-mailing him back?
AI know that there were staff members that kept in touch with
        him.

QDo you know that his sister was e-mailing him about Jeff's
        condition and about his death?
AYes.

QYou see your in-laws what, at special events like Christmas?  
AI see them, is that what you said?

QThat's what you said, you saw them at special events.  
AHis sister was -- (inaudible) -- but his father --(inaudible).

QHis what?  
AHis father on holidays.

QOn holidays?  
AUh-huh (yes).

QYou take your children over there on holidays; is that right?  
AI see them sometimes on holidays.

QSometimes?  
AYes. If I do see them, it would be on a holiday.

QHave you talked to Jerry Messina?  
AYes.

QAnd you and he conferred about how this case was going to be tried, didn't you?  
AConferred about this case?

QYes.  
AWe've talked about everything that he has -- since we had -- (inaudible).

QDo you remember when you filed your complaint?  
AThe date of the filing?
QYes, the date you wrote the letter to the Board.

A No, I don't, it was two and a half years ago.

Q I'm sorry, excuse me. So you filed this on October -- it was stamped with the Medical Board October of '05; is that right?

A Yes.

Q And when did you get the letter from the collection agency?

A Not long before that?

QI don't know. I really don't know. I'm sure it was before that. Not long had gone by.

MR. KNOX: I have no further questions.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, do you want to redirect?

MR. JIMISON: Just a few minutes, Dr. Rhyne.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

QIf you could turn to the thin notebook, please.

ATurn to what?

QThe Board's thin notebook. Exhibit 22.

A What number?

MR. JIMISON: Number 22.

MS. GODFREY: We're going to object to this. The complaints as put before the Medical Board have lots of hearsay in them and being this complaint and this witness has been here to testify about it.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Excuse me, I didn't hear the last sentence that you said.

MS. GODFREY: I'm sorry. We object to the admission of the complaints themselves because they do have hearsay in them. This witness has been here -- here and examined about it so we object to the Board considering the complaint itself because it does have hearsay in it.

MR. JIMISON: Dr. Rhyne, they opened the door to this complaint. They asked many questions about when did you file this complaint, they -- they made questions which made implications that she filed the complaint because of the collection agency, this being referred, they asked when she filed the complaint. They clearly opened the door to this complaint coming into evidence, so they waive any objection by -- by questioning her on the complaint.

They waived all objections at that point. They completely opened the door.

MR. KNOX: That would completely open the door for us to go back and examine her. I just asked her two questions about when it was filed and -- and what her chief complaint was about in the case and that's factual reference.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah, I'm going to overrule the objections --
MR. JIMISON: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- the Board can continue. Go ahead.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) If you can identify Tab 22, Exhibit 22.

Was that the complaint you filed with the Medical Board?

AYes.

QOkay.

MR. JIMISON: At this point, I'd like to enter the Board's Exhibit 22 into evidence.

MR. KNOX: Well, to begin with, we object on the basis of hearsay that's included in it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry, you object to --

MR. KNOX: We object on the basis it's full of hearsay about what somebody told.

MR. JIMISON: And, again, the Board claims they waived all objections when they questioned her on the complaint.

Okay. And also --

MR. KNOX: Wait a minute. Is your --

MS. GODFREY: She did.

MR. KNOX: I mean, if she did, I didn't hear.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry, for not speaking in the mike.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) And now I hate to keep flipping back and forth, but they -- they mentioned -- now back to their exhibit, Patient's Exhibit -- I mean, Dr. Buttar's Exhibit
Number 17, could you refer back to that?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: This is in their book?

MS. GODFREY: Yes.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) He asked you many questions about the Consent to Treatment form, correct?

AYes.

QThat is fair to say that Consent to Treatment form is about one paragraph long?

AYes.

QIs that the bottom of Patient Information and Registration form?

AYes.

QI'd like to read to you the first sentence of that, but before I do, do you recall Mr. Knox asking you about questions about Dr. Buttar treating your husband's immune system, correct?

AYes.

QWell, now I'd like to read the first sentence. "I authorize the medical and nursing staff of Advanced Concepts in Medicine to perform diagnostic tests and administer treatment plans for allergy, immune disorders, nutritional disorders, cancer and other chronic medical conditions."

Correct?
Q: So that first sentence is saying that he's consenting to Advance Concepts in Medicine, the staff themselves, to administer treatment plans for cancer?
A: Right.
Q: Was it your understanding that your husband was getting treatment for cancer when you went to Dr. Buttar's office?
A: MR. KNOX: We'll object to --
A: Yes, absolutely.
MR. KNOX: -- this is leading. I mean, just it's him testifying and we object to the leading.
Q: (By Mr. Jimison) What was your understanding -- I'll rephrase.
What was your understanding of what your husband was being treated for when he went to Dr. Buttar's office?
A: He was being treated for his cancer.
Q: Okay. Did -- did Dr. Buttar, during that meeting, say he was doing any research for cancer treatments?
A: No.
Q: Did he say he was doing any experimentations on cancer treatments?
A: No.
Q: Did he say that his treatments were experimental?
QDid he tell you about any of the side effects of hydrogen peroxide or ozone or chelation therapy?

A No.

QDid -- did he mention anything about an Institutional Review Board that reviews his work?

A No.

MR. KNOX: Well, objection. I guess he could ask her if they discussed anything? To ask these continuous, repeated --

MR. JIMISON: I'm asking about questions that --

MR. KNOX: Well, I made my objection, may I be heard?

MR. JIMISON: I can respond to his objection.

MR. KNOX: Well, you don't have to interrupt.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. Mr. Jimison, could you -- what is your line of questioning here?

MR. JIMISON: The question is what was not said during that -- that meeting with Dr. Buttar and that Ms. Kenny contended because he clearly asked her about what was said or what this form said. I'm trying to get what was not said.

QDid -- did he --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. I would say just move on --
MR. JIMISON: Okay. Just a few -- few more, just one or two.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) "The therapies will compliment the care I received from my primary care physician." Did Dr. Buttar encourage your husband to stay with his oncologist?

A No.

MS. GODFREY: Objection.

MR. KNOX: Objection.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Ask it again.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) It's a question during -- I'm just asking what he did or did not say. Did he ask about staying on with your oncologist during that first meeting?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm going to overrule your objection since she was there.

MR. KNOX: Okay.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Did he say -- did he encourage your husband to stay on with his oncologist after -- during that first meeting?

A No, he did not.

MR. JIMISON: That's all.

MR. KNOX: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Objection? Okay.

MR. KNOX: Just a couple of questions.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Knox.

RE CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

Q You fully understood that he signed this Advanced Concepts in Alternative and Preventive Medicine and initialed it at every place acknowledging that they explained in detail the purpose of the chelation therapy, correct?

MS. GODFREY: Page 3 of Exhibit 17.

MR. KNOX: 17.

MS. GODFREY: Buttar's 17.

MR. KNOX: All right.

Q (By Mr. Knox) You got it?

A Yeah, I do.

A Yeah.

Q And he's initialled his name all the way down there that he understood that this was -- the chelation therapy was to help his immune system, and correct me if I'm not right, you testified that Dr. Buttar explained that the treatment was to help his immune system. Didn't you say that previously?

A Yes.

Q So when you -- he did not say the cancer, but he said this would help -- the chelation would help the immune system and that may help his condition with the cancer, is that a fair statement?
ANo.

QOkay. And notwithstanding all of that, with all of the doctors aside, he elected to have the therapy, am I right?

AHe did elect to have it, yes.

QAnd you never went back to object until you got a $6700 bill --

MR. JIMISON: Objection, asked and answered.

A I want to say to you that my husband started this when he was alive. It's not hearsay that I repeated it.

QThe last question is it is my informed decision that I accept chelation treatment as an alternative approach to surgical and other individual therapies. Okay. Do you read that?

A It's about midway of the second paragraph.

AOn the chelation page?

QYeah. Read the second paragraph. Have you read it?

AUh-huh (yes).

QAnd there's not one word in that paragraph that your husband signed that talks about curing cancer, correct?

ANo, it doesn't in that paragraph.

MR. KNOX: That's all I have.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Anything else? Any Board Members have questions?

EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

DR. MCCULLOCH: Thanks for being here, Ms. Kenny.
You were present at the first visit with Dr. Buttar?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: Correct me if I'm wrong, was it your testimony that he informed your husband that he has 100 percent success rate in curing cancer?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: A 100 percent success rate in curing cancer is your --

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: Despite what he may have signed or the papers that are here on exhibit, that's what he said?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: Okay. One other question, it's a little difficult, but you tried alternative medicine for several months?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: And in your estimation, it failed?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: Why -- did you and your husband have conversations about why he would want to continue with more alternative medicine in Mexico?

WITNESS: Well, he considered the Issles Clinic early on.

Dr. Buttar initially claims that he did exactly what they
do there, that he in fact created a lot of things that they do use there and he wanted to stay in the country because it was cheaper here. But when that did not work, he chose to go out of the country and to go there.

DR. McCULLOCH: That's all I have, thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I just have one question. Were you with your husband when Dr. Buttar explained the CAT scan that showed the progression of the disease?

WITNESS: No. My husband just brought that report home.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. So you were not with him?

WITNESS: Uh-uh (no).

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. We thank you very much for coming, Mrs. Kenny. We're all very sorry for your loss.

WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. JIMISON: At this point, the Board would like to call Mr. Messina, but we have to do it by telephone and I need to get the person in here to do the telephone. I don't know if the Board Members would like to take a five-minute break.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We'll take a five-minute break.

MS. GODFREY: A five-minute break?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Uh-huh (yes).

MS. GODFREY: Thank you.
(11:12 A.M. - 11:25 A.M. RECESS)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Mr. Jimison, do you have another witness at this point?

MR. JIMISON: Okay. We now -- the Board would now like to call Mr. Messina to the stand. Mr. Messina, are you on the telephone?

(DISCUSSION OFF RECORD)

MR. JIMISON: Okay. Mr. Messina, are you there? Hello.

MR. MESSINA: Hello.

MR. JIMISON: Mr. Messina, my name is Marcus Jimison. I'm an attorney for the Medical Board.

MR. MESSINA: Yes.

MR. JIMISON: We're now -- you're now being broadcast to the entire Medical Board. And I would like to now have you be addressed by Dr. Rhyne.

MR. MESSINA: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Messina, I'm Dr. Rhyne and I'm the presiding officer. Drs. McCulloch and Walker are here with me and we will proceed now to swear you in.

Do you solemnly swear that your testimony will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you
God.

WITNESS: Yes.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You may proceed.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. Thank you.

**DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:**

Q Mr. Messina, could you state your name please for the Board?

AI'm sorry?

Q Could you state your name please for the Board?

AJerry Messina.

Q And where do you presently live, Mr. Messina?

ALos Angeles, California.

Q And how are you related to Patient B?

AShe was my aunt.

Q And describe your aunt for the Board, please.

ADescribe her as a person?

AYes, sir.

Q She's -- she was very caring. She was always there for my

brothers and I, no matter what. She loved us dearly and

she was a very strong woman that wanted to beat cancer.

Q Did your aunt get cancer at some point in her life?

AShe was diagnosed in 2002.

Q Do you know what her diagnosis was?

AOvarian cancer.
Q And how old was your aunt when she got diagnosed?
AFifty.

Q Okay. And how was she first treated for cancer, if you know?
AShe was first treated with chemotherapy.

Q Okay. And did that cure her of her cancer?
A No.

Q And at some point did your aunt continue to receive chemotherapy for her cancer?
AYes. She had three different chemo treatments.

Q Did any of it work?
A The first one started to work and reduced the cancer a significant amount. The second one did not and the third one moderately.

Q Okay. Did her cancer spread, to your knowledge?
A I don't know.

Q Okay. At some point did your aunt go see Dr. Buttar?
AYes.

MS. GODFREY: Well, I'm going to object unless this witness has personal knowledge of his aunt's interactions with Dr. Buttar.

MR. JIMISON: There is an exception to the --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Wait a minute. Well, go ahead.

MR. JIMISON: If you look at 804 -- Rule 804 about the
hearsay, it says: Exceptions to the hearsay rule are statements of personal and family history and it says the statement concerning the clearance on adoption, divorce, marital, family history or other -- or other similar fact of personal or family history even though declarant had no means to inquire in personal knowledge, it's an exception if the declarant was related to, other by blood, adoption, marriage, what's intimately associated with the other's family as likely to have accurate information concerning the matter declared.

So essentially it's a matter of family history, what her medical condition was, it can show the person's related and have intimate knowledge of this person's medical history.

MS. GODFREY: No. I think he's allowed to testify that he is her nephew and that he knows that because somebody told him that at one time in his life. But I don't think this covers what he's about to get into which is her interactions with Dr. Buttar. Dr. Buttar's interactions with her were not family history and not -- and something that he learned -- unless -- unless he was present, he learned it by someone else telling him and it could have been somebody else in the family or his aunt herself.
But he didn't -- unless he was present here in North Carolina of his own personal knowledge whatever he knows about his aunt's interactions with Dr. Buttar will be hearsay.

MR. JIMISON: Dr. Rhyne, I can hand up the rule that says -- it talks about hearsay exceptions where the declarant is unavailable.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Can you give us a copy of that rule?

MR. JIMISON: Yeah.

DR. WALKER: It's actually in the motions.

MR. JIMISON: I don't think she had 804.

MS. GODFREY: I copied 804. I believe it's in the motion.

Is 804 there?

MR. KNOX: And it's a statement of personal or family history.

MR. JIMISON: But if you go back and look up that before that, you'll see -- you'll see the rule is actually when the declarant is unavailable. And they talk about under number 3 --

MS. GODFREY: That's the 3. Okay. The statement against --

MR. JIMISON: Is unable to be present or testify at a hearing because of death. Here we have witnesses who have
died, so clearly they can't testify. And then if you go to the exceptions, the following are exceptions. The statement under belief of impending death, a statement made by declarant while believing that her death was imminent concerning the cause or circumstances -- not just the cause but the circumstances -- of what he believe his or her impending death.

And then you go to number 4, a statement concerning the foregoing matters and death also of another person if the declarant was related to, either by blood, adoption or marriage or was so intimately associated with the other's family as to be likely to have accurate information concerning the matters declared. And all I'm asking is basically the events leading up to her death.

MS. GODFREY: Well, Mr. Jimison has an interesting reading of this. Traditionally --

MR. JIMISON: I think it's just a reading.

MS. GODFREY: Traditionally, statements under belief of impending death, the way it's taught in law school is dying declarations. And, you know, if somebody gets shot and they identify their murderer, you know, as they're dying, then the law allows that hearsay into evidence. This is not that situation.
MR. JIMISON: Well, we haven't gotten that. We haven't even laid down --

MS. GODFREY: Mr. Jimison, I let you speak without interrupting you. I'd appreciate the same courtesy.
The other thing, the statements of personal or family history, that's an exception that has to do with what I said. Mr. Messina knows he's the nephew of Patient B because somebody told him. But, again, the law says that that's okay for him to know that by hearsay because obviously that's the only way he could know it.
This does not cover interactions with her doctor that he was not witness to. He learned that -- he learned what he learned either through conversations with his aunt or conversations with his mother who was his aunt's sister who's not even a witness here. And we would object to any testimony that he has to offer unless he can say he came to North Carolina and personally observed.
MR. JIMISON: The objection was made before really I think I asked -- at this point, I have truly forgotten what the question was, but -- but in any event, I'll rephrase the questions, lay a foundation, and then you'll see where I'm going and if there is anything that you believe is improper, then I'll just withdraw the questions.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right. We will proceed on that, but I do agree that he cannot testify as to conversations between the patient and Dr. Buttar if he was not present.

MR. JIMISON: Well, no, just want to ask about their own conversations between themselves, he and his aunt.

MS. GODFREY: Well, again, that's -- that's hearsay as well.

MR. JIMISON: And like I said, I'll lay the foundation and when we get there --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We'll rule on the individual questions.

MS. GODFREY: Absolutely.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Were you -- how often did you have conversations with your aunt while she -- when she had cancer? I'm not asking you to tell me what she said, just how often.

A We talked a couple of times a week, if not almost every day.

Q I'm sorry, I was still asking the question and I was not done and I know it's kind of two-fold. I'm not asking you what your aunt said to you, I'm just asking how often did you have conversations with your aunt during the time that she had cancer?

A A couple of times a week, if not almost every single day.

Q And how close were you to your aunt?
A Extremely close.

Q And why was that?

A She was an incredible aunt. Again, when she was -- she would just take care of us all the time. She was always there and we were just a close family. She was my mom's only sibling.

Q And at some point -- when did your aunt pass away?


Q And how -- and did you have a conversation with her prior to her passing away?

A I saw my aunt two weeks before she died.

Q And that was personally?

A I'm sorry?

Q And that was personally you saw her?

A Yes, I went to her in Carolina to -- knowing that she was close to death and I wanted to say good-bye in person.

Q And describe how your aunt looked when you visited her.

A She was a skeleton with skin.

Q Was she bedridden?

A Yes, she couldn't walk any more. We would transfer her out of bed and into a wheelchair, onto the couch. She -- she couldn't move herself at all.

Q And how -- how long was she in this condition, if you know?
At least a month.

And -- and what treatments were your -- if you know, what treatments were your aunt getting for her condition at that time?

At which time?

The time you visited her two weeks before her death?

She wasn't getting any treatment except for hospice at that time.

Okay. To your knowledge, had her cancer spread?

Yes.

And where was her cancer at this point? What body organs was it affecting?

I don't know. It wasn't something we really discussed. All I know is that -- they -- my aunt didn't want to worry her family and, I mean, it was just obvious it was -- it was all over and I just -- I don't know.

And how old was your aunt at this point, 50?

Fifty-two.

Fifty-two. Did she discuss the circumstances of why she was dying with you?

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection. I mean --

MR. JIMISON: I think that's well within the rule. I mean --
MS. GODFREY: She was dying -- she was dying of cancer, right?

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Did she ever discuss her -- her illness with you during that time when you saw her two weeks before she died?

A Not really.

Q Okay. During that time, did she ever discuss anything regarding Dr. Buttar?

A Yes.

Q And that's two weeks before she died?

A Even when she started going to Buttar.

Q Okay. Well, specifically the moment before she died --

A When I saw her?

Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear your response.

A When I saw her?

Q Yes, sir.

A Yes. She specifically told me she wished she never started going to Buttar.

MS. GODFREY: Objection to what she told him at that point.

MR. JIMISON: I mean, a dying declaration, it's a lot --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah, that's -- it's two weeks before.

Yeah, that's -- I'm going to sustain that. Not what Buttar said -- what Dr. Buttar said, it's what she said.
Q (By Mr. Jimison) After that conversation with your aunt two weeks before she died, how did you feel?

A That I was going to lose an extremely important person in my life.

Q Did you form an opinion about Dr. Buttar?

MR. KNOX: Objection.

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection.

MR. JIMISON: No, I'm just asking -- I mean, I'm not asking what his opinion is, just asking if he formed an opinion.

A Not at that time.

Q Okay. At some point did you file a complaint with the Medical Board?

A Yes.

Q And why did you file that complaint?

A Because on my aunt's death bed, she said to me she wished she had never started going, that his treatment rapidly increased her demise.

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection.

MR. KNOX: That's what was sustained a few minutes ago.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well --

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Do you know Ms. Kenny?

MR. KNOX: Excuse me, did you rule?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. I -- that is not admissible to
say that.

MR. KNOX:  Thank you.

Q(By Mr. Jimison)  Okay.  Mr. Messina, did you ever talk to
Ms. Kenny about your experience with her?

AWith -- who is her?

QMs. Stephanie Kenny.

AYes, we've spoken.

QAnd what did y'all talk about.

MR. KNOX:  Objection, irrelevance.

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  Right.

MR. JIMISON:  There's been -- he asked about in
cross-examination, so he's already waived that.

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  That is true.  That's already been
brought up before.

MR. JIMISON:  So you mean we can't ask the question?

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  No, overruled, you can ask the
question --

MR. JIMISON:  Okay.

Q(By Mr. Jimison)  The -- what did you and Ms. Kenny talk about?

AWell, we talked -- we ended up -- my aunt had mentioned this
man, Jeffrey Kenny, that he was seeing Buttar at the same
time and I guess they had crossed paths in Buttar's office.

And she had given me her e-mail password when I saw her
and in her e-mail was the Kennys information and that is when I decided to call and speak with him, but unfortunately he had already passed away, so I started speaking with Stephanie. And we just started discussing how the demise of our two loved ones had rapidly increased during and after Buttar's treatment.

MR. KNOX: Objection.

MS. GODFREY: Objection.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah, that's --

MR. KNOX: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We can't go there.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) How has the experience with -- between you and your aunt and Dr. Buttar affected you?

AI didn't hear your question.

QHow has this experience with your aunt and Dr. Buttar affected you?

MS. GODFREY: Objection.

MR. JIMISON: I'm not asking him what anyone said --

MS. GODFREY: How has it affected him.

MR. JIMISON: -- I'm just asking how it affected --

MS. GODFREY: How is that relevant --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah.

MS. GODFREY: -- to this?
MR. JIMISON: It goes to victim impact. I mean, the same question was asked of Ms. Kenny without objection. It's a standard question about how these matters affect people personally. I mean, you can give it a lot of weight if you want to, but, I mean, I do think it's relevant.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Okay. Mr. Messina, how had this experience with your aunt and Dr. Buttar affected you?

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection for the record.

WITNESS: Do I continue at this point?

MR. JIMISON: Yes, sir.

A Okay. Could you repeat the question one more time?

Q (By Mr. Jimison) How has this experience affected you?

A This experience has at this point gone on for three and a half years.

I'm sorry, you have to repeat the question one more time.

MR. KNOX: Objection --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Let's just move on.

MR. JIMISON: I'll just leave it there. Thank you, Mr. Messina.

MR. KNOX: I agree, can we move on?

MR. JIMISON: I'll just leave it there. Thank you, Mr. Messina.
Now, the lawyer from the other side is able to ask, so stay on the phone.

WITNESS: Yes.

MR. JIMISON: Okay, thank you.

MS. GODFREY: Thank you.

**CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:**

Q Mr. Messina?

A Yes.

Q You are in Los Angeles, correct?

A That is correct.

Q And is your cell phone number 323 --

A Mr. JIMISON: Objection, relevance.

MS. GODFREY: Well, I still have --

MR. JIMISON: It's just -- it is -- we could attach an exhibit. Now, everybody in the public is going to have his cell phone. I think that's an invasion of privacy and I mean, the witness has privacy rights.

MS. GODFREY: Well, I want to just ask him --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I think we could go ahead --

MS. GODFREY: -- if he got messages from me and from members of my office through the weekend --

MR. JIMISON: Well, you can ask that question.

MS. GODFREY: -- or over the past week to ask -- asking
them -- asking him to call us.

Q (By Ms. Godfrey) Did you receive any messages?
A Yes, I did.

Q Okay. And you didn't call us to talk to us ahead of your testimony here, did you?
A That is correct and I have the right not to.

Q Okay. Now, during the whole time that your aunt was treating with Dr. Buttar, you were in Los Angeles the entire time; is that correct?
A Correct.

Q And you not only talked to your aunt on the phone, but you talked to your mother, that's Olga Messina?
A Correct.

Q And she had opinions about your aunt's treatment too, didn't she?
A No, not necessarily.

Q Okay. She didn't have any opinions about your aunt's treatment?
A I'm sure she did, but I'm not my -- I'm not Olga Messina.

Q Okay. Well, she didn't convey anything to you about what she thought about your aunt's treatment with Dr. Buttar?
A No.

Q Now, your mother was executor of your aunt's estate, was she
not?
AYes.
QAnd we have marked as Exhibit 16 a copy of your aunt's estate file and I know you can't see that because you're not here in the room with us.
But it's true that your -- your mother was executor and she settled with -- with a number of medical providers after your aunt's death, did she not?
AYes.
QBut Dr. -- she did not pay anything to Dr. Buttar, did she?
ANo, because we had an attorney that put in the 30-day requirement to contact and Buttar's office did not contact until after or past the 30 days.
QOkay. So nothing was collected from your aunt's estate by Dr. Buttar; isn't that right?
ANot the estate, but while my aunt was alive, yes.
QOkay. She paid her -- she paid him some money while she was alive?
AYes.
QAre you aware that your aunt was discharged from Dr. Buttar's practice for non-compliance?
ANo, she was not.
QOkay. Well, that's your opinion, but you -- you don't know
anything about the medical records in this case, correct?
A No, except for what my aunt told me that she stopped going
to him.
Q Okay. So if the medical records in this case reflect that
your aunt was discharged from Dr. Buttar's practice for
non-compliance, you don't have any opinion about that?
A No, because she told me that she stopped going to him.
Q Okay. And are you aware that your -- your aunt was referred
to Dr. Buttar by her family doctor?
A I believe so, but I'm not exactly sure about that.
Q Okay. Now, also, Mr. Messina, what year did your aunt die?
Q She died in 2004?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Okay. So it's been four years since her death?
A Three and a half at this point.
Q Three and a half.
A It was late -- it was late 2004.
Q And you're aware that your aunt died five months after she
stopped treatment with -- with Dr. Buttar; isn't that
right?
A I think it was less than that.
Q Well, if the record shows she stopped treatment in June and
died in November, that's five months, isn't it?

Okay. Was it June? I don't know.

Okay. And you're aware she only went to -- to Dr. Buttar's clinic for a short period of time?

That I do know. It was a couple of months.

MS. GODFREY: Okay. I don't have any further questions.

MR. JIMISON: Dr. Rhyne, I do have --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yes, would you like to cross-examine?

MR. JIMISON: Sure, redirect.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I mean redirect.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

QMr. Messina, you heard Ms. Godfrey ask you questions about whether your aunt was discharged for non-compliance, correct?

AI'm sorry, repeat that again, I was --

QShe asked you whether your aunt was discharged from Dr. Buttar's care for non-compliance, correct?

ACorrect.

QAnd she also brought up certain matters about your aunt's estate?

AYes.

QAnd you said your aunt -- she -- she also mentioned that she only went there for a couple of months?
A: Yes.

   MS. GODFREY: Objection.

Q: She asked you about that, correct?

   PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well --

   MS. GODFREY: What I stated was for a short period of time.

   I think the records reflect the amount of time, but it
   wasn't a couple of months.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Well, okay. The question about a short
   period of time, correct?

A: Yes.

Q: Why did your aunt stop going to see Dr. Buttar?

A: Well, the main reason --

   MS. GODFREY: Objection.

A: -- she stopped was because he took off for about three weeks,

   I think, for some sort of trip, honeymoon, and the
   treatments were still being done the same, at the same
   price even though there was -- was no doctor available
   except for just nurses. And also because his treatments
   to her was extremely rude and frightening to her actually.

   MS. GODFREY: Well --

   PRESIDENT RHYNE: I believe that that needs to be --

   MS. GODFREY: -- objection, move to strike. He could
   only know that by what his aunt told him.
MR. JIMISON: Well, at this point, Ms. Godfrey asked questions about why she left the practice. Again, I believe she's opened the door to this line of testimony. She's waived all objections.

MS. GODFREY: I don't think I waived anything.

MR. JIMISON: If -- if she asked about -- if she asked about her -- this patient being discharged from Dr. Buttar's practice to this witness, then we have the right to explore fully why this witness believes that patient was discharged.

MS. GODFREY: Well, I beg to differ. I -- I asked him if he reviewed the medical records and if he knew anything about what the medical records reflected that is the reason the patient was discharged from the practice.

MR. JIMISON: She asked -- you said -- she asked a question that this patient was discharged for non-compliance, thus, making the implication that this patient was discharged from Dr. Buttar because she did not do something that Dr. Buttar asked her to do. Therefore, she put it in play to explore fully with this witness why she was discharged.

MS. GODFREY: Well --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Proceed.

MS. GODFREY: -- the -- the medical records are in
evidence and the medical records --

MR. JIMISON: She didn't have to ask question about this witness --

MS. GODFREY: -- excuse me. Excuse me, Your Honor. The medical records reflect that this patient was discharged for non-compliance and that's all I asked, if he was aware of that.

MR. JIMISON: But as soon as she asked the question, she opens the door to explore it.

MS. GODFREY: Well --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right.

MS. GODFREY: -- I would object.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go head, move on.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. I'll just ask a few questions.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Again, could you finish your answer about why you -- why your aunt stopped seeing Dr. Buttar?

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection because everything he knows is hearsay.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) If you -- if you can go ahead, Mr. Messina.

ASure. She -- she started to become very afraid of Buttar. Again, his treatments were making her extremely weak. It was a far drive for her. At one point she even told me that she felt he was a drill sergeant and she was a
cadet. He would just sit there and humiliate her at points.

And after being gone for the three weeks, she -- she stopped going during that time that he was gone and wanted -- then went back after and then that's when she stopped going after that.

MS. GODFREY: Well, move to strike on the basis of it's all hearsay, it's all --

MR. JIMISON: Again --

MS. GODFREY: -- it's been told by someone else.

MR. JIMISON: -- same argument, she opened the door, asked him about why she was discharged, why she left the practice.

He's just explaining. She asked it to this witness, so this witness --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I think you need to make it clear in the record that this -- he was not there --

MR. JIMISON: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- and he didn't hear --

MR. JIMISON: Sure.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- this is what his aunt relayed to him.

MR. JIMISON: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: But we cannot accept that.
Q(By Mr. Jimison) Mr. Messina, what is your -- where did your aunt live in North Carolina?
ARutherfordton.
QAnd she drove from -- did she drive from Rutherfordton to -- to Dr. Buttar's office or did she get a hotel room?
AShe -- for a while, her and her fiance would drive to Buttar and then at a certain point, I don't remember when, she got an apartment in -- I believe it was Cornelius.
QOkay. Ms. Godfrey asked you -- and just one or two questions, Dr. Rhyne.

Ms. Godfrey asked you about certain claims that were made on the estate to you.
AYes.
QDo you know how much money Dr. -- your aunt paid to Dr. Buttar?
AI do not know how much she paid him.
QDo you have an idea?
MS. GODFREY: Well, objection.
QFrom -- from your knowledge of the estate.
MS. GODFREY: Objection.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah, that's --
MR. JIMISON: Okay. I'll withdraw it.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: That's needs to be withdrawn.
MR. JIMISON: I'm through.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Ms. Godfrey, do you want to recross?

RE CROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:

Q Your aunt's boyfriend, his name --

A Fiancée.

Q Fiancée, excuse me, was Alex?

A Yes.

Q And Alex supported her in the treatment; isn't that correct?

A Alex pushed her.

Q Okay. And the family disagreed with Alex; isn't that right? After her death. At the time, we wanted anything to help my aunt and, you know, help her survive and we believe anything would have worked.

Q Okay. So but -- but Alex and the family saw things differently as far as Dr. Buttar's treatment; isn't that right, Mr. Messina?

A Could you repeat that, please?

Q I'm sorry?

A You're just very soft, your voice.

Q Okay. Let me repeat the question.

A Alex and the family saw things differently as -- as to Dr. Buttar's treatment. Is that a fair statement?

A Yes, that is a fair statement.
MS. GODFREY: Okay. That's all I have.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Messina.

WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. JIMISON: We would now like to place another telephone call witness.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: How many more witnesses are you going to have at this point?

MR. JIMISON: Unfortunately, they're going slow. We have five more witnesses including -- that includes Dr. Peterson, four witnesses and Dr. Peterson. I hope to be done by 2:00 this afternoon, but, you know, it is slow. I'll try to go faster.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: How long do you anticipate this next one? I'm trying to decide --

MR. JIMISON: I will try to make it about ten minutes of direct.

MS. GODFREY: And this is Ms. XXXXXX (Mother of Patient E)?

MR. JIMISON: Yeah. Well, at this point I'd like to clear the courtroom. She wants to testify on behalf of her daughter which I think makes her standing that she was the patient and she wants to identify herself only in a
closed courtroom, but then she'll be happy to testify publicly after stating her name.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yes, sir. If you both attorneys approach.

(BENCH CONFERENCE OFF THE RECORD)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Proceed.

MR. JIMISON: We're going to make a request to clear the hearing room, so the witness can identify herself and then she'll be willing to testify in public.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. The hearing room will be cleared.

(COURTROOM CLEARED)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Counsel, just educate me. When you clear the courtroom, the record -- the court reporter stays in?

MR. JIMISON: Oh, absolutely, yeah.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. JIMISON: Just -- it just means, you know, people who are entitled to be here --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. JIMISON: -- or that has to be. Could we have --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Can we get the media person in here to make sure the camera is off.

COURT REPORTER: It's off.
(TELEPHONE CONVERSATION WITH MOTHER OF PATIENT E)

MR. JIMISON: Hello, Ms. XXXXXX (Mother of Patient E).

MS. XXXXXX (Mother of Patient E): Yes.

MR. JIMISON: Okay, hi. This is Marcus Jimison, attorney from the Medical Board. You've been speaking to Ms. Carpenter and she indicated that you would like to introduce yourself in closed session, but then testify in public so long as people refer to you only as Patient E's mother.

MOTHER OF PATIENT E: Right.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. Well, let me go ahead and start, but first Dr. Rhyne, President of the Board, needs to swear you in.

MOTHER OF PATIENT E: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you, Ms. XXXXXX (Mother of Patient E.) Do you solemnly swear that your testimony will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

MOTHER OF PATIENT E: I do.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

Q Could you state your name for the record, please?

AXXXXXXXX X. XXXXXX. (Mother of Patient E)

Q And are you related to Patient E?
AI am.

Q And what's your relation?

AI'm her mother.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. We'll pause now.

(WHEREUPON, THE PUBLIC RETURNED TO THE HEARING ROOM)

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Ma'am, we're going to move quickly. You know, I know we've talked about some things, but I'm going to try to move as quickly as possible.

A Okay.

Q Did your daughter ever see -- did you ever have occasion to go to Dr. Buttar for treatment for your daughter?

A Yes.

Q And what was that treatment for?

A For what appears to be metal toxicity relative to her autism.

Q Okay. And at some point did you start treating your child with -- with instructions from Dr. Buttar's office?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q Could you explain what happened? Just -- just explain what happened when you started treating your child with materials from Dr. Buttar's office.

A Initially we gave her a regimen of minerals, vitamins for a period for approximately four to six weeks which went unremarkably, you know.
And following that we began grouping testing in addition to chelation process where three days a week, we applied an agent to remove any toxic metals from her system and the opposite days we reloaded her systems with minerals and vitamins that were depleted.

Q: Who did the chelation therapy?
A: We administered the therapy, her parents.

Q: And when did you do this?
A: The beginning of -- about the second month of treatment on Mondays, Wednesday and Fridays.

Q: Okay. And where do you presently live?

Q: Did these -- did your daughter ever see Dr. Buttar before you started these treatments?
A: No.

Q: Explain that.
A: The understanding was that we were required to see the doctor at least once in an annual period, but that we could begin the initial treatment process through phone consultations.

Q: Did you see anyone then from Dr. Buttar's office?
A: No, I did not.

Q: So this transaction occurred how?
A: Over the phone.
Q: You started treating your -- your child for -- with chelation therapy for autism with materials you got from Dr. Buttar's office, correct?

A: Correct.

Q: And that's started all through telephone consultations you had with Dr. Buttar's office?

A: That's right.

Q: And your daughter never made a personal visit to Dr. Buttar's office prior to these treatments?

A: That's right.

Q: When you had these telephone consultations with Dr. Buttar's office, did -- was it with Dr. Buttar?

A: No.

Q: Who was it with?

A: With Jane Garcia.

Q: And who is Ms. Garcia?

A: I understand her to be his nurse.

Q: Okay. And is she a nurse practitioner perhaps?

A: I'm not aware if she is.

Q: Okay. Did Ms. Garcia ever make any recommendations about what to do with your child's medication she was presently on?

A: Yes. She insisted that we remove my daughter from the medication or they would not pursue the treatment.
QWhat medication was your daughter on?

A Lexapro for anxiety --

Q And -- and how long did -- how long had your daughter been on Lexapro?

A About a period of a year.

Q And who prescribed that Lexapro?

A Her local pediatrician.

Q Did Dr. Buttar's office consult with your local pediatrician when they recommended that she be taken off Lexapro?

A No, they did not.

Q And at some point what happened to your daughter after she started -- after you started self-administering this chelation cream?

A Initially, it was uneventful, but she began to deteriorate, regress is how it's referred to, and the regression was extremely significant. We were unable to even get her to come out of the home when she had previously been very social and happy. She wouldn't wear clothes. She was no longer sleeping through the night. She wasn't eating properly and she was extremely restless.

Q Okay. And did you consult Dr. Buttar's office about these issues?

A Absolutely.
Q: And what was the response?

A: That we just needed to continue because this was to be expected, that she was moving metal and that we just needed to keep doing what we were doing.

Q: Okay. And -- and did you continue to do that?

A: Yes.

Q: And at some -- and how did your daughter respond even after you continued the -- the treatments?

A: She just continued to get worse.

Q: And at some point did -- what did you do after that?

A: Well, we had made an appointment to come to the office in person and we had hoped at that point, with an in-person physical examination by the doctor, we would get some remedy and advice for the significant amount of deterioration we were experiencing.

Q: Okay. Prior to -- when -- you started this therapy, I believe you testified in January of '07, correct?

A: Right.

Q: Did you have contact with Dr. Buttar's office prior to January of '07?

A: Yes. Approximately November of '06 was our first contact.

Q: Okay. Could it have been September -- as early as September 27th of '06?
Q: Yes, that's possible.

A: Okay. You don't have this, but I'll bring it to the Board's attention, if they can turn to Exhibit 5 on the thin notebook, Exhibit 5, page 36. If you can look at page 36 on Exhibit 5. We have the medical record of your -- of your daughter that's been admitted into evidence.

A: Okay.

Q: And I'll read to you a note and ask you to comment. It says:

Discussed plan with Jane, concur on issue regarding Lexapro, reassess patient that worsening is to be expected due to Herxheimer's response and due to mobilization. Due to age consider IV challenge for best metal yield.

Is that when you talked -- is that when you and Dr. Buttar's office began talking about --

A: I'm sorry, can you repeat that? My phone calling interrupted.

Q: I'm sorry. It says: Discussed plan with Jane, concur on issue regarding Lexapro. Is that when you had a conversation about taking your child off Lexapro?

A: Yes, but I hope that's not referring to me concurring.

Q: Okay. And above that there's a typed note that says: Plan to wean off Lexapro, discussed with Dr. Buttar.

But is -- were you having conversations with Ms. Garcia to take your child off Lexapro and then start this chelation
therapy for your child's autism?

A Yes, we had discussed it twice.

Q Okay. And -- and then you began the autism treatments in January, correct?

A Correct.

Q And how did the materials get to you?

A By the mail.

Q And -- and was there any lab testing involved?

A Yes, routine lab testing was urine, stool, hair.

Q And who did this lab testing?

A Either we did or if it required a blood draw, a local phlebotomy clinic.

Q And all this was occurring in Michigan?

A That's correct.

Q And when your daughter got the chelation cream, who administers that?

A We did, the parents.

Q And how did you do it? Did you do it pursuant to instructions from Dr. Buttar's office?

A Yes.

Q And -- and all this is occurring without you ever coming to North Carolina to see Dr. Buttar or his nurse practitioner?

A That's correct.
Q: Did you have to send money to Dr. Buttar's office before these materials were sent to you?

A: Yes.

Q: How much money did you send?

A: The initial was right at $3,000.

Q: Okay. You talked about your daughter deteriorating and then you said you made an appointment to see Dr. Buttar. Approximately when was that?

A: Approximately April.

Q: And what happened after you made that appointment?

A: We were -- we did another round of testing that was expected to arrive in the office prior to our visit for a review on that and other than that, we simply prepared for the trip.

Q: Okay. When you got to North Carolina what -- did you go to Dr. Buttar's office?

A: Yes.

Q: Was he there?

A: No, he was not.

Q: Who did you see?

A: Ms. Garcia.

Q: And did you express that you wanted to see the doctor?

A: We were surprised that he wasn't there and --
MR. KNOX: Objection, it's not --
A-- but we would led to understand that that was normal.

MR. KNOX: Hold on a minute. That is not responsive to what was asked. She said, we hoped he would be there.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right. I agree, strike that -- that statement.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Okay. Did you have a meeting with Ms. Garcia?
AWe did.

QDid Ms. Garcia examine your child during that meeting?
AShe was in a room, but she didn't have an examination, no.

QOkay. And what was the result of that meeting with Ms. Garcia?
AThe large part of the meeting was the -- for lack of a better word -- sell -- to first do IV chelation.

QAnd -- and did you do that?
ANo, we did not.

QAnd why not?
AMY daughter was already significantly deteriorating and appeared to be very sick and there was no way we were going to go get a more aggressive form --

QOkay.

A-- when we haven't even seen the doctor.

QAnd how is your daughter doing now?
AShe's fine, she's much better.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. And that's all I have.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Godfrey --

MR. KNOX: Yeah.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- Mr. Knox, do you want to

cross-examine?

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

QGood morning. I won't be able to call your name for the record, but good morning to you.

AGood morning.

QAs I understand it you -- you live in Michigan, do you?

AYes.

QAnd your child is now being treated by a doctor close by?

AThat's correct.

QIs that an alternative doctor as well?

ANO, but he's not opposed to holistic medicine.

QAnd is the child taking any type of a comparable therapy that was recommended to you by Dr. Buttar like chelation or minerals and things of that nature?

ANot at this time.

QDid she take some after you left Dr. Buttar? She did, didn't she?

AOh, probably for about another month, we continued with the
minerals and vitamins.

Q So as I understand it, you got word that Dr. -- and that doctor is closer that treated you with alternative therapy than Dr. Buttar was, right? Where was that --

ARight.

Q Where was that doctor?

A He's in Dearborn, Michigan.

Q And how close is that to where you live in -- where do you live?

A We're in Brownstown. It's about a 20 minute ride.

Q Okay. And it's about 8, 10 hours from where you were to Dr. Buttar's office, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And that was part of the reason you called requesting that some modalities be sent to you, am I right?

A Absolutely.

Q And -- and so Dr. Buttar's nurse or whoever, did you send anything about the child and what her -- write out a summary about her aggressiveness and how she acted out and things of that nature to Dr. Buttar?

A I'm sure we did.

Q Okay. So they had the information of what you knew about your daughter. And what was her underlying problem anyway?
What is she?

AShe's autistic.

QOkay. And you knew doctor -- have you ever used any across-the-counter medications to help your child?

AWell, for common colds and things of that nature, sure.

QAnd so you called down there and they explained to you that they could send you not intravenous medicines, but some minerals and things to place on the child's skin, am I right?

ARight.

QAnd so that's what was sent and you applied it?

AAnd I did what?

QYou made an application of it in accordance to the instructions that were sent to you, correct?

AThat's correct.

QAnd your child had been aggressive prior to seeing Dr. Buttar, is that a fair statement?

AAbsolutely.

QAnd she had acted out repeatedly?

AIN the past, yes.

QAnd you had a pediatric physician that was treating you for that with Lexapro which is a psychological antidepressant drug?
Actually, it was prescribed for anxiety and OCD behaviors.

Q And you were never told by Dr. Buttar's people to terminate Lexapro, but to reduce the quantity of it; is that correct?

A No, that's not correct. I was told to terminate, that it had to be weaned completely before we would start any treatment.

Q The point I make is, she was never off of the Lexapro totally?

A Yeah, she was.

Q And did you ever -- was still under the treatment of your pediatrician?

A Only for routine things.

Q Okay. Well, we would go to the pediatrician -- I'm sorry, we got these records late. So tell me when you first went to -- when you first called Dr. Buttar's office. Do you remember?

A It was in the last quarter of 2006.

Q The last quarter?

A Yeah.

Q And -- and when did you actually come to his office for the first time?

A I believe it was right around April. It was in the spring.

Q Is that April of '07?

A That's correct.
QNow, I understood you to say that you hoped to see Dr. Buttar, but you didn't have a prior arrangement to Dr. Buttar personally, did you?

A We assumed when we made the appointment that the doctor would be present.

Q I understand.

A That's usually the way it goes.

Q But you said you had hoped to see him and when you got there you saw Jane Garcia, correct?

A Correct.

Q And you found her to be informative and helpful, that's fair, isn't it?

A That's fair.

Q Okay. And she spent a good bit of time with your child, but she also went into the fact that you had to discipline your child some; is that true?

A My daughter wasn't acting up that day. She was completely behaved. So, no, we did not discuss discipline that day.

Q She wasn't banging on the doors and beating on the chairs in the presence of other people?

A No, she was not.

Q Okay.

A She was remarkably well behaved that day, oddly enough.
Q: Well, is that different than what it was before you went to Dr. Buttar that she was better behaved; is that correct?

A: That she was better behaved prior to seeing him?

Q: Well, she had been on the medication that Dr. Buttar shipped to you and you said she was behaving remarkably well that day and that was better than usual.

A: In the office that day --

Q: Was she still --

A: -- not the whole visit down there or in the hotel or -- in the office that day, she was good.

Q: And was she still on the medication of the mineral supplements that Dr. Buttar sent to you, yes or no?

A: Yes.

Q: Now, what is your training?

A: My training?

Q: Yes.

A: I'm a homemaker currently.

Q: Okay.

A: My background is in finance, if that's what you mean.

Q: Okay. And what is your husband's training?

A: He's an engineer.

Q: Okay. And I take it, you checked out the proposals on the Internet of Dr. Buttar and his treatment plan; is that
correct?

That's correct.

Q Now, when you went back, right after you withdrew from Dr. Buttar, you went to another alternative doctor. And I don't mean to repeat myself, but who was that doctor?

A We saw Dr. --

MR. JIMISON: Well, objection because this kind of goes to identity. I think it's -- you know, discuss some identity issues, but if she could just identify the doctor by an initial, by her/his initials. I mean, I don't know -- because clearly we're not going to be able to call this doctor at this late hour, so I don't know why it helps to probably know this doctor's name one way or the other.

Q I don't know how that could be personal, but was it DeMio?

A But that -- yes.

Q And he is what we call a D.A.N. doctor, right?

A Correct.

Q What's a D.A.N. doctor?

A They follow a protocol that's laid out by a group of doctors that gathers each year relative to the treatment of autism.

Q To treat autism, correct?

A Correct.

Q And they use all types of chelation therapy and minerals and
things of that nature to benefit the children that have
autism, correct?
AYes, that's correct.

QSo when you finally decided to go to another alternative doctor
-- I'm going to read to you since you're on the telephone
and can't see this, this is Exhibit 32.

MS. GODFREY: A page from the medical record.

MR. KNOX: It's a page of the medical record. Do you have
it in front of you? I know you've got a lot of books.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: It's in your book?


MR. KNOX: In our exhibit book.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: An e-mail?

MR. KNOX: Yes.

Q(By Mr. Knox) This is an e-mail from -- and I won't read your
name for the record, but do you remember sending an e-mail
on July the 6th, 2007 and you may not know the time, but
it was about 2:37 p.m. to Kadena Blake? Do you remember
that?

ARead it to me and I'll tell you if I remember it.

QAll right. It says: Hi, Kadena. I just wanted to give notice
that we were canceling this appointment and will not be
rescheduling. And somehow this is partially written --
had gotten so severe that we sought advice through several sources and decided ultimately to change physicians. She is now in the care of -- and I'm going to abbreviate that doctor's name -- Dr. D. of Cleveland, Ohio, a D.A.N. doctor also with a child that has autism and has made significant gains in just a short period.

Do you remember that?

AYes.

And you remember that this doctor that you went to had a child with autism and you certainly wanted -- and -- and then the next thing that happens is, it says: We think this is the best course for us and we found him to be more flexible regarding the individual needs of -- and trying alternative treatment schedule/substances to meet those needs.

And then down at the bottom, I'm going to read you this paragraph in the interest of doing it. Your staff has been very helpful and pleasant and we are grateful. We are friends with a family who are doing your protocols successfully. It simply was not working for -- and I have taken the name out -- and it was most assuredly as your child and most assuredly not because we failed to discipline her appropriately, but because her system was
not tolerating the protocol.

Correct?

ACorrect.

QWe are sorry it did not work for us, but we are grateful to all doctors and practices like yours seeking to help our children live better, healthier lives. Good luck and God bless. Correct?

AThat's right.

QYou didn't put one word in that e-mail, you know, we're leaving you because we don't like Dr. Buttar and he didn't show up, did you?

ANO.

QAll right. And you didn't put one word in there about the fact that you were upset with the methodology and treatment and the reduction or the termination of Lexapro, did you?

AIN a roundabout way. No, I wasn't specific, you're right.

QWell, there's not a word about that.

AI wasn't specific.

QOkay. Well, it's right important that when you sent this stuff -- this e-mail, you had already selected another doctor, the same kind of doctor that does chelation therapy, minerals, etcetera and you had moved on away from Dr. Buttar. Isn't that fair?
AYeah.

Q That doctor was about 20 minutes away and Dr. --

ANo. He was not about 20 minutes away.

Q I'm sorry, I thought you said 20. I apologize. I withdraw
that, excuse me.

MR. KNOX: And that's all I have.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, do you want to redirect?

MR. JIMISON: Sure.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

Q Ma'am--

AYes.

Q-- when -- when -- how did you -- how did you find out about
this Medical Board case?

AI received an e-mail from Dr. Buttar's office.

Q And what was the substance of that e-mail?

AThat they were being reviewed for their practices, that
eventually they were going to fight the accusations against
him and they viewed it as a witch hunt, they hoped for
our prays and support.

Q Okay. And did they -- was there anything in the e-mail about
Dr. Buttar saying there was -- that the Board had alleged
there was little doctor contact between him and his
patients?
AThat's correct, yes.
QAnd when you read that what was your response?
AWell, that was essentially what intrigued me and our -- our problem or our -- our complaints or our disapproval was that we had never seen the doctor in spite of our description of her extreme regression.
And so when we saw that there was obviously other complaints or there was even acknowledgment that these people hadn't even seen a doctor that had instructed them or support that you had mentioned that we hadn't either.
QYou had contact with Dr. Buttar's office perhaps as early as September of '06?
AUh-huh (yes). Yes.
QAll the way through basically July of '07?
ARight.
QAnd at any point have you ever physically or personally met Dr. Buttar?
ANo, I have not.
QAnd during that time, Dr. Buttar's office was sending you medicines, transdermal chelation agents, how to test your daughter without physically seeing your child?
MR. KNOX: Objection, been asked and answered.
AYes.
QOkay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We'll strike that.

MR. JIMISON: Thank you.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Well, let me just say, how many times did -- just one of -- because if there was all this talk about these other doctors who you've gone to see, have they seen your child?

AAbsolutely.

QHow often do --

AEvery single time.

QHow often do they see your child?

ASeveral times a year.

QAnd did they start treatment before seeing your child?

ANO, they did not.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. Thank you.

RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

QAnd one other question.

ASure.

QYou never came to North Carolina but one time; is that correct?

AThat's correct.

QAnd Jane and the employees were always accessible to you when you called?

AThat is correct.
MR. KNOX: All right. Thank you.

WITNESS: Sure.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Anything else? Any of the Board Members have a question? Go ahead.

DR. McCULLOCH: Thank you.

**EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:**

DR. McCULLOCH: Ma'am?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: This is Dr. McCulloch with the Board.

I have a couple of questions, just real brief.

It says in the record that I have in front of me that they recommended that Lexapro be reduced to a half cc and then later to a quarter of a cc two times or for two weeks.

WITNESS: Right.

DR. McCULLOCH: Now, that seems to be in conflict with what you said that they told you that your child had to come off the Lexapro altogether.

WITNESS: That's correct. I would categorically -- I may not be able to remember every detail, but that was what I was told. And I remember so distinctly because we had objected to it because of how much it had helped our daughter.

DR. McCULLOCH: So it's your testimony despite what it
says in this record that Lexapro was just you discontinue
the Lexapro because of their recommendation to you?
WITNESS: Absolutely. And the only reason she was weaned
is because we had a second conversation where I still had
not removed her from the Lexapro and I was concerned about
just pulling her off it completely.
DR. McCULLOCH: Oh, okay. So this might have been just
early on in the weaning process.
WITNESS: Perhaps.
DR. McCULLOCH: All right. Now, what was your purpose
of the visit to North Carolina?
WITNESS: To identify whether or not my daughter was having
metal toxicity and to treat that toxicity.
DR. McCULLOCH: So you never had -- did you have -- you
had -- you obviously had an expectation that you would
meet Dr. Buttar. But did you -- were you ever told that
you would meet the doctor?
WITNESS: I don't know that I was specifically told, no.
DR. McCULLOCH: All right. I can understand that would
be a reasonable expectation, but that you -- you had no --
there was no arrangement for you to meet with the doctor;
is that correct?
WITNESS: That's correct.
DR. McCULLOCH: All right. Thank you.

WITNESS: Sure.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: This is Dr. Rhyne and I wanted to ask you a few questions just following up on that Lexapro question.

Were you initially told to stop the Lexapro, just stop it or were you told to wean off of it for a --

WITNESS: I was told to stop it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So you were told to stop the first time?

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And you did not -- you elected not to stop it; is that correct?

WITNESS: That's correct.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Now, did you have laboratories done showing that your daughter had heavy metal toxicity either in Michigan or in North Carolina?

WITNESS: Yes, we did.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And where were they done?

WITNESS: But they were out-of-state labs that they were shipped to.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And they were given to Dr. Buttar's office before you started treatment; is that correct?

WITNESS: Yes. And previous physicians we had seen, we
knew that she had toxicity.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. That's -- that's all I have to ask.

MR. JIMISON: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you very much.

WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry. I don't want to interrupt the Board.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead, Mr. Knox.

FURTHER RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

Q Ma'am, there's an e-mail from Kelly to you on October 5 that said, I was looking over the e-mail I sent to you and I wanted to clarify it.

MR. JIMISON: Objection, Dr. Rhyne. There's -- at this point we're at the recross and that is limited only to the questions that you answered. There's not a free reign after we go to what's called serve recross. So the rebuttal of any question has to be -- has to be confined to matters that the Board Members have brought up.

MR. KNOX: I just object to him being the intellectual lawyer that knows all the laws and I --

MR. JIMISON: I think that's a true statement.

MR. KNOX: May I finish? This is witness's case and has been, since we started I've been tutored. It's hard for
me to accept the result.
The point I make is the question I'm about to ask is the reduction in the Lexapro which she testified to and that's the exact question --

MR. JIMISON: Okay.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay, ma'am --

MS. GODFREY: Did you identify the --
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Knox, go ahead and ask.

MS. GODFREY: -- Exhibit 5.

MR. KNOX: Exhibit 5.

MS. GODFREY: The Board's Exhibit 5, page 47.

MR. KNOX: May I proceed, ma'am?
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Please do.

Q(By Mr. Knox) Back to this -- this was from Kelly to you and -- and it was dated Thursday, October the 5th. I was looking over the e-mail I sent to you. I wanted to clarify that I was referring to the Lexapro as been prescribed again for your child. Again, keep her at the 1.5 milligrams, but you may bump it up to 2, if necessary. Do you remember getting that e-mail?

ARight.

QThat was notwithstanding, and you said there was -- you unilaterally -- they told you to stop cold turkey, but
you broke it down in two different times, right?

A What do you mean I broke it down into --

Q In other words, you did not stop it cold turkey, but you took

her off some amount to start with and then a second time

you took her off a certain amount. Is that true?

A She was weaned, yes.

Q Yeah. And so -- and that's exactly what they had told you

at the doctor's office, to reduce it half and then to a

fourth. Am I right?

A Not initially.

Q Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Thank you very much.

WITNESS: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I think at this point, we'll go ahead

and take a break.

MR. JIMISON: I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: It's now 12:35 and we can resume back

1:30. I don't know if that gives you enough time to really

have lunch.

MR. KNOX: Anyway, we can find something to eat.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. 1:30 should give you time to get

back.

MS. GODFREY: We'll do that.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

(12:35 P.M. - 1:39 P.M. LUNCH RECESS)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Mr. Jimison, are you ready to proceed.

MR. JIMISON: I call Marie Church to the stand.

WHEREUPON,

MARIE CHURCH,

being first duly sworn,

was examined and testified

as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

QGood afternoon, Ms. Church, could you introduce yourself to the Board Members, please?

AI'm Marie Church.

QWould you please use the microphone.

AI'm Marie Church.

QAnd where do you presently live?

ALEnoir, North Carolina.

QAnd do you work with Dr. Herman?
AYes.

QAnd how long have you worked for Dr. Herman?

ANine years.

QAnd are you related to Patient A?

AYes, she's my mother.

QAnd at some point was your mother diagnosed with cancer?

AYes.

QAnd when was that?

AThe first time?

QYes, ma'am.

AI can't remember. I think it was 2003.

QAnd how was your mother originally treated -- initially treated

after she received that diagnosis?

AShe would get a radical hysterectomy and was treated with

radiation therapy.

QAnd did that stop the cancer from progressing?

AAt the time, they said it was gone.

QDid it come back?

AYes, it did.

QAnd after it came back, what did your mother do? How did she

get care for the cancer after it came back?

AWe had seen a local doctor here and they sent her to an

oncologist.
Q: And -- and what therapies did that oncologist provide?
A: We considered M.D. Anderson and they really couldn't do anything for her here, so we had -- that her -- my mother and father went to M.D. Anderson in Texas.

Q: Okay. And what's your understanding of M.D. Anderson as a cancer center?
A: Well, if she knows.
Q: Only if you know.
A: I know they do a lot of experimental things.

Q: Okay. And -- and did the therapies that they tried at M.D. Anderson, did they work?
A: No.

Q: And what did your mother do after that?
A: We had checked into some alternative therapies that could be done.

Q: And specifically what type of alternative therapies?
A: The hydrogen peroxide.

Q: And -- and at some point did you -- did your mother go see Dr. Buttar?
A: Yes.

Q: And how did she learn of Dr. Buttar?
A: We had her see the book that had information about the treatments in it and we had called a doctor's office in
Canada and they gave us the number of Dr. Buttar.

Q And this hydrogen peroxide therapy, did you know it under a name of oxygen therapy?
A Yes.

MS. GODFREY: Well, object to the leading.

Q Do you know hydrogen peroxide under a different name?
A Well, we -- it's a type of oxygen therapy, is what it is.

Q Okay. And did you go with your mother to Dr. Buttar's office?
A Yes.

Q Did you go with her the first time she went there?
A Yes.

Q Did you see Dr. Buttar on that first visit?
A No.

Q Who did you see on that first visit?
A Jane, the nurse practitioner.

Q What's Jane's last name?
A Well, at the time it was different. I don't know what it is now. I don't know what it is now.

Q Would it be Ms. Garcia?
A Yes.

Q What did she tell you -- tell me about that conversation that you and your mother had with Ms. Garcia on that first visit?
A We had explained her situation and she looked over the notes
and they told me the type of treatment they did. And she
told us that they could help her at the time of the visit.
QDid -- you said the type of treatments that they did. Were
these treatments for cancer?
MS. GODFREY: Well, objection.
QI mean, if you know.
MS. GODFREY: Objection to what --
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Wait. What's your objection?
MS. GODFREY: Well, I don't know the type of treatments
who gives.
MR. JIMISON: Dr. Buttar gives.
Q(By Mr. Jimison) Did he say what it was for? Did Ms. Garcia
say what the treatments were for?
AThey were for cancer patients.
QAnd she said they could help your mother?
AThey could help, yes.
QWhat -- did you go to your -- with your mother for her therapies?
AYes.
QDid you go with her every time?
AYes.
QAnd how did your mother get to Dr. Buttar's office for the
therapies?
AI drove. We stayed in a hotel at the time.
Q: You stayed at a hotel --
A: Yes.

Q: -- while your mother was getting therapies?
A: Yes.

Q: And how often would she get therapies?
A: Every day.

Q: Five --
A: Except for Saturday and Sunday.

Q: So she would get therapies Monday through Friday?
A: Yes.

Q: And -- and she received those therapies from Dr. Buttar's office?
A: Yes.

Q: And how long would she be in Dr. Buttar's office during those days?
A: Around -- it depended on the day. It was between 8 to 5, or sometimes we would come in at 9.

Q: So basically 40 hours a week?
A: Yes.

Q: Five days a week. And how many weeks did she -- she get therapy from Dr. Buttar?
A: It was -- it was around a month.

Q: Okay. How often did your mother see or did you see Dr. Buttar
when she was there to receive her therapies?

AI seen him maybe three to four times.

Q Did Dr. Buttar ever examine your mother?

AI think the first time she met him. I didn't go in the room at that time.

Q Okay. Despite your mother's going to Dr. Buttar, did her cancer still progress?

AYes.

Q Describe your mother's physical appearance to the caregivers -- during this time she was receiving therapy, describe her physical appearance.

ABeginning or --

Q At the beginning and ending.

AAt the beginning of the treatments, she wasn't in real good shape to begin with and she had swelled some in the stomach area. During the treatment time, she did, you know, the first or second week, she went off her pain meds and then she had to go back on them again. During that time, she kept swelling in her stomach and fluid kept building up and so we had to have that drained off one time.

And more towards the end, she started swelling a lot in her legs, but then it progressed from there and she was
unable to walk real good, so I had to put her in a wheelchair at the very end.

Q Was she jaundiced?
A Yes.

Q And how -- how did her skin look?
A It was yellow.

Q Was that visible to the caregivers there at Dr. Buttar's clinic?
A Not at the beginning, but more towards the end, she did turn jaundice.

Q Okay. Describe the IV treatments. How -- how long did it take per day for her to get all the IVs that Dr. Buttar was giving her?
A Usually with this, it was mostly about all day unless they done the hyperbaric treatments which she didn't do much.

Q And why was your mother not able to have the hyperbaric treatments?
A She was claustrophobic.

Q What were the IVs, if you know, that were administered to your mother while you were in there in the office with her?
A What were they?
Q Uh-huh (yes).
A I don't know exactly what all of them were. I know one of
them was the peroxide, I think, and one of them was for her liver and I'm not sure about the other ones. I think there were some vitamins.

QOnly if you can recall, was one of them ozone?

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection.

QIf you recall.

MR. JIMISON: Only if she recalls.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Wait a minute. What is your objection?

MS. GODFREY: I'm objecting to the leading, putting words in the witness's mouth.

MR. JIMISON: I'm just asking was one of them an ozone.

MR. KNOX: She said she didn't --

MR. JIMISON: If she knows.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: She said she didn't know.

MR. JIMISON: Okay.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) So hydrogen peroxide, vitamins?

AYes.

QAnd how -- how many IVs would he run a day?

AWell, they would change the bags out. It was -- I don't know the exact amount, but it was like three or four maybe. It may have been more. I don't know.

QDid your mother get chelation therapy?

AShe was getting the drop treatments, yes.
Q: And when she was getting these treatments five days a week for several weeks, did this -- did her physical condition get better or worse from your observations?
A: She never got better as far as the physical condition.
Q: I know this is difficult, but tell me about the day your mother died.
A: She was unresponsive at the time. She wasn't even conscious. She was at the hospital.
Q: Which hospital was she at?
A: Lake Norman Medical.
Q: And is that a hospital near Dr. Buttar's office?
A: Yes.
Q: And was she getting treatments from Dr. Buttar's office up to the moment she died?
A: I believe that Thursday was her last treatment and I took her to the ER that night.
Q: Was she scheduled to come in the next day for treatment?
A: Yes.
Q: So she finished her treatments on that Thursday and you took her to the hospital that Thursday night?
A: Yes.
Q: Why did you take her to the hospital?
A: Because she had a lot of pressure on her stomach, the fluid
had started building up again. And since they had drained it off the first time, that's what -- she thought that what's they could do again, but when we got there, they were unable to.

Q And did she die -- when you took her to the hospital that Thursday night, did she die at the hospital?
A No, she died on that Saturday, the 19th of August.

Q Where at?
A At Lake Norman.

Q So she never left the hospital --
A No.

Q -- from when you took her?
A She was there at Dr. Buttar's office getting treatment on that Thursday. Did -- did you ever have a conversation with Dr. Buttar about whether to continue treatment for your mother?
A Yes.

Q And what was that conversation?
A Well, Jane had come to me about she didn't think the treatments were helping.

And then I went and spoke to Dr. Buttar and asked him -- you know, talked to him about it and asked him what he thought I should do.
And, you know, he -- he said he didn't -- you know, he wasn't the type of person to give up and I told him I wanted to do what she wanted to do and she wanted to continue on with the treatments at the time.

Q So your mother wanted to keep on with the treatments at the time --

A Yeah, she said we'll discuss it this weekend and I remember we never got to that weekend because that was the weekend she was in the hospital.

Q How much money did you pay -- did your parents pay Dr. Buttar for any of the treatments for your mother?

A I'm not sure. I know we paid $12,000 up front, I believe it was, and then I think it was around six. I'm thinking it was three to six a week. I can't remember. It was probably around $30,000, I'm not sure.

Q Did you call complaining in this case?

A No.

Q And why did you not call and complain?

A I didn't see a need to. I mean, I just --

Q Are you aware that a complaint was filed on behalf of your mother?

A Not until just recently.

Q Do you know who filed that complaint?
MR. JIMISON: I have no other questions.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Do you want to cross-examine,

Ms. Godfrey?

MS. GODFREY: I do.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:

Q Ms. Church, you're here under subpoena today, correct?

A Yes.

Q And it was your desire not to be involved in these proceedings; isn't that correct?

A Yes.

Q And sometime about a week or so ago Mr. Jimison called you at work, correct?

A Yes.

Q And you work as the receptionist in Dr. Herman's clinic?

A Correct.

Q And you've been the receptionist there since 1999?

A Yes.

Q And Mr. -- even though you didn't want to talk to Mr. Jimison,
you did talk to him, correct?
AYes.
QAnd after that conversation, he issued a subpoena for you to come here to testify today?
AYes.
QAnd that's why you're here, not because you want to be?
ANo, just by subpoena.
QNow, did you accompany your mother to M.D. Anderson?
ANo.
QWhat is -- is your understanding when they came back from M.D. Anderson, was there anything else that they could do for her?
AShe had had two treatments at M.D. Anderson and on the last trip they told her that there was nothing else that they could do for her.
QOkay. And -- and her -- did your father accompany her down there?
AYes.
QAnd they flew back and forth to Texas?
AThree times.
QThree times. And they stayed down at M.D. Anderson for a period of time --
AUh-huh (yes).
Q-- in, I guess, a hotel or something down there --
AYes.

Q-- while she was getting chemotherapy treatments at M.D. Anderson --
AYes.

Q-- is that correct?
And they -- they did that in May and June of 2006, shortly after her cancer came back?
AYes, when we found out in April.

QOkay. And after -- after she was released from M.D. Anderson, after they told her there was nothing more they could do, that was when your father and mother sought out Dr. Buttar?
ACorrect.

QAnd that was their decision to do?
AYes.

QAnd you say your father had some kind of book that -- that you -- that he found out about Dr. Buttar through?
AYes.

QOkay. During this time was your mother able to make decisions for herself?
AYes, she was.

QOkay. And when -- when you first went to Dr. Buttar, was your father with your mother, father --
The first -- the first visit, yes.

Q: Okay. And you were there?

A: Yes.

Q: And the three of you looked over the paperwork that she --

A: that -- that she was to sign?

Q: We looked over it, but I couldn't tell you anything it said.

Q: Okay. I understand. But -- but your mother and your father

A: were there --

A: Yes.

Q: -- and they looked over the paperwork?

A: Yes.

Q: And she signed it?

A: Yes.

Q: Now, when you met with Jane the first time, she explained to

A: you that -- that they had a different approach than the

Q: conventional treatments for cancer?

A: That's what I recall, as to what I recall, yes.

Q: Okay. And did she explain to you that their approach was to

A: treat the patient and build up the patient's strength and

Q: immune system to help them better battle the cancer on

A: their own?

A: Yes.

Q: Okay. And that was what you understood Dr. Buttar's treatment
was directed towards; isn't that right?

A The cancer, yes.

Q Okay. It was directed to the cancer, but it was directed
towards building the patient's immune system and resources
to be able to better fight the cancer themselves?

A Yeah, they treated that and metal toxicity as far as the
mercury.

Q Okay. And was it explained to you that the metal toxicity
on your -- on Dr. Buttar's approach was something that
would -- would help the body better able to fight the
cancer?

A Yes, getting rid of the mercury would help.

Q Okay. Now, they never said they would cure the cancer, did
they?

A No.

Q And they never said that there was a 100 percent chance of
success?

A No.

Q And when -- when your mother was treating with Dr. Buttar,
you accompanied her back and forth and your father gave
you the money to pay Dr. Buttar's office?

A Yes.

Q And at first your mother showed some improvement, did she not?
AYeah. The first week or so, she went off her pain meds.

QOkay.

AThat was the improvement she showed, but then she had to go back on it.

QOkay. So she had a short period of feeling better?

AYes.

QOkay. And at that -- and later on in August, you say you discussed it with Dr. Buttar and Jane that the treatments didn't seem to be helping; isn't that right?

AThey had come to me, I didn't go to them. They had come to me and said they didn't think it was helping her.

QOkay. And at that point your mother was still adamant about continuing on?

AWhen I -- I talked to her before I talked to them I said, do you want to just go on home and she said, we'll talk about it this weekend. I'll go ahead and go to it this week and we'll talk about it this weekend, is what she told me.

QOkay. So she wanted to finish out the week, that was her desire?

AYes.

QOkay. Would you say your mother had a strong will to fight that cancer?
Yes.

Q And a strong will to want to get better?

A (Nods head in affirmative response.)

Q Okay. After your mother's death, did you and your father return to Dr. Buttar's clinic to return some medications?

A Yes.

Q And you were given a refund --

A We did --

Q -- of about $2500, weren't you?

A Correct.

Q Okay. And you and your dad said good-bye to the staff at that time, did you not?

A Well, I had talked to a couple of the nurses that were there. I cannot recall their names.

Q Okay. And you were on good terms with the staff at that time?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And you never heard anything about a complaint filed against the medical -- against Dr. Buttar until about a couple of months ago, did you?

A On our part, yes.

Q Okay.

A No, I --

Q Let me rephrase that question because I think it was confusing,
I'm sorry.

When did you first find out that a complaint had been filed against Dr. Buttar?

A From Dr. Herman.

Q When?

A It was I guess when the Medical Board had requested records.

Q Okay. And would that have been in early February of 2008?

A A couple of months ago?

Q I don't know if it's been that long ago, but I had found the records, is the reason I knew.

Q Okay. So within the last month or two --

A Recently, yes.

Q Okay. And that was after your mother died in August of 2006?

A Correct.

Q So no one ever talked to you at all about -- from the Medical Board --

A No.

Q -- between August of 2006 and just this past week or so?

A No.

Q And you never knew anything about a complaint?

A No.

Q Okay. And your dad is still alive, right?

A Correct, yes, he is.
QAnd he's not expressed any desire to be involved in this either?
ANo, he doesn't want to be.

QOh. One other question. Dr. Herman is a family practice doctor, right?
AYes, she is.

QAnd she took care of your mom for a long time?
AYes. She seen her occasionally.

QOkay. And -- but during the time that your mom was undergoing cancer treatments both at M.D. Anderson -- well, let me -- let me back up and break that up.

After your mom's cancer came back, did she ever see Dr. Herman?
AThat was when we found out that she had cancer.

QOkay. But after -- after --
ANo.

Q-- she was diagnosed with the -- with the recurrence, did she ever go back to see Dr. Herman?
ANo. After we got the results, no.

QAnd did Dr. Herman ever see your mother while she was being treated by Dr. Buttar?
AI don't believe so, no.

QDid she ever come to your house to visit her or --
ANo.
MS. GODFREY: Okay. That's all I have.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, do you want to redirect?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

Q When you spoke to me, were you on a conference call to Ms. Carpenter as well? Do you recall that?

AYes.

Q Did we tell you you had to speak with us?

AYou said that we had to, but you said you had thought about doing a subpoena and that you know that I didn't want to get involved in it. And after you talked to me, I went ahead and said, yeah, go ahead and do it because I felt like you were going to subpoena me anyway.

MR. JIMISON: That's all.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Do you want to recross?

MS. GODFREY: No.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Any Board Members have any questions?

I have one question.

EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You said during this time something about that your mom had some fluid drained off her stomach.

WITNESS: Yes. She had had an ultrasound done and they had drained some fluid after the ultrasound.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Uh-huh (yes). And -- and where was that
done? Was that -- did Dr. Buttar do that?

WITNESS: Lake Norman.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So it was done at the hospital?

WITNESS: Yeah, it was. Yeah, they had ordered an -- well, he had ordered an ultrasound through another doctor.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry, who had ordered it?

WITNESS: Dr. Buttar has sent us -- sent us to another doctor and then they -- we had got an ultrasound after that.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. So it was another doctor you saw?

WITNESS: Yes.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And -- and what kind of doctor was that doctor?

WITNESS: A urologist. I believe that's what he was.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much, Ms. Church, for testifying and we are truly sorry for your loss.

Mr. Jimison?

MR. JIMISON: The Board would now like to call Dr. Herman to the stand.

WHEREUPON,

DENNICE H. HERMAN, M.D.,
being first duly sworn,
was examined and testified
as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

Q Dr. Herman, could you introduce yourself to the Members of
the Board, please?

A My name is Dr. Dennice Herman and I'm a family practitioner
in Lenoir, North Carolina.

Q And how long have you been a family practitioner?

A I've been in Lenoir for 19 years. I did about eight and a
half years of emergency medicine and then went back to
family medicine about nine and a half years ago.

Q Are you presently board certified?

A Yes.

Q In what?

A In family medicine.

Q Okay. And did you know Patient A?

A Yes.

Q And how did you know Patient A?

A I know her both professionally and personally. She did see
me as a patient on occasions and then I knew her because
her daughter is one of our employees in the office and
I had met her in social settings as well.

QOkay. And did you ever treat her as a patient?
AYes, I did.

QAt some point, did Patient A get cancer?
AYes.

QAnd how did you understand -- how did you learn of that diagnosis?
AI did not actually diagnose her. She had been seeing a GYN physician for some pelvic problems and was somewhat inadvertently diagnosed with cervical cancer. She had actually had some negative PAP smears and then had some bleeding and upon re-examination was diagnosed with cervical cancer.

QAnd did you treat her after that diagnosis of cervical cancer?
AMaybe a couple of times right after her initial treatment for colds and things like that. I did not -- I certainly was not involved in her cancer treatment initially.

QAnd Ms. Church, she works for you, correct?
AWell, we both work for the hospital. It’s a hospital-owned practice.

QOkay. And are you familiar with the cancer center, M.D. Anderson?
AYes.
Q: And what's your understanding of M.D. Anderson?
A: It is supposed to be one of the premier cancer centers in the country.
Q: Does it have the reputation of -- what kind of a reputation does it have for cancer?
A: It's supposed to be very progressive and looking on the cutting edge, so to speak, of cancer treatment.
Q: And at some point did you ever become aware that Patient A sought treatment at M.D. Anderson?
A: Yes. Actually, what happened and I don't have records in front of me, but I did bring her chart. At some time I think it was around April of '06, she had apparently been doing very well after her hysterectomy and radiation treatment. She came to me with a history of right upper quadrant pain and some nausea associated with eating. And my initial impression was, she probably had gallbladder disease and, therefore, I arranged for her to go for the initial ultrasound.
Q: And do you want me to continue with that?
A: Yes.
Q: The -- she went to Valdese Hospital for an ultrasound and the radiologist actually called me right after he did the ultrasound and said she doesn't have gallbladder disease,
but she had multiple liver metastases and also had some pulmonary or lung metastases as well. And to be honest, I was very shocked at that. He was very certain at that point that it was metastases.

QOkay. And why don't you treat cancer as a family practitioner?

AI'm not trained to treat cancer. I follow my patients along with oncologists and other physicians who are treating them for cancer and treat the other chronic problems that they may have such as diabetes or hypertension, but I have no training in cancer, therefore, I don't treat it.

QWhy is that important for you to only treat those diseases that you have training in?

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection. I think we're getting into an expert witness area.

MR. JIMISON: She's a doctor. I can qualify her, if you would like.

MS. GODFREY: Well, she was not named as an expert witness and I took her deposition, but it was not with the understanding that she was going to be asked for her medical opinions on things. The Board has an expert witness that they did designate already and they did not designate Dr. Herman as an expert witness, but simply as a fact witness.

MR. JIMISON: There -- there is no -- again, there has
been no rule or citation of any rule or statute. An expert witness can give an opinion on an ultimate legal matter like was this within the standard of care. I'm not asking her about whether treatments by Dr. Buttar were within the standard of care for a cancer doctor. The question was, why is it important for you as a physician to only treat those diseases that you have training in. It's not even -- it's not an expert opinion about the quality of care.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Proceed and answer the question.

I'm sorry, what was the question?

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Why is it important for you to treat only those diseases that you got trained in?

ABecause the one thing I remember -- try to remember most frequently and that is Primum Non Nocere which means first do no harm. And I think that when physicians are -- are treating things that they are not well-trained in, they may inadvertently do harm.

If I might just digress, I was reading in the lobby the --

MS. GODFREY: Well --

A-- the copy of the Forum and one of the first things is your patients build a trusting relationship with you and they respect your advice and your recommendations for treatment
and they expect that they will receive appropriate treatments.

QOkay. As a physician, are you familiar with any of the following treatments: hydrogen peroxide --

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection again. She's not an expert witness and she says she doesn't treat cancer patients.

MR. JIMISON: I'm only asking her if she's familiar with these treatments.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. KNOX: May I say something?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yes.

MR. KNOX: The Rules of Evidence apply and when you don't name an expert even in a medical malpractice case, you cannot subject and alert everybody that you know the truth is the doctor is an expert. It's clear and the statement that he's making is absolutely a erroneous statement. And they never told us that she would be an expert, so we didn't ask her about her opinion. We asked her about the observations that she had learned from somebody else which is hearsay and we would object to.

MR. JIMISON: Again, I mean, I don't want to go back and forth, but it's -- you know, this constant back and forth between counsel. I'm trying very hard to avoid it. The --
their -- the question is, is she familiar with these therapies and I'm not asking her for her opinion. I'm asking her as a doctor, are you familiar with these therapies. An expert witness is designated because they can give an opinion about therapies. I'm only asking if she's familiar, that's all.

MR. KNOX: Well, the proper question is do you know whether or not -- do you know what hydrogen peroxide is, but he puts in a phrase -- phase as a family practitioner doctor, so and so, so and so, and that's an absolute erroneous opinion and --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, I would agree that you need to rephrase your question so that they are not leading and -- and she was not designated as an expert.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Are you familiar with hydrogen peroxide therapy?
AI am not.

QAre you familiar with ozone therapy?
ANo.

QAre you familiar with hyperbaric chamber therapy?
AVery little, mainly not related to cancer therapy.

QAnd did you file a complaint with the Board?
AI did.
QAnd why?

AI struggled with this because in my 19 years of medicine, I never filed a complaint against another physician and it was very difficult for me to come to that decision. But I felt like that my patient and her family were being taken advantage of when they were in a very -- very serious situation.

And I was concerned about the therapy that she was receiving and the fact that it was preventing her from being able to spend quality time with her family and, quote, get her affairs in order and deal with life and death and for her family to do the same.

And, therefore -- and also the cost that it was incurring to the family who are middle class, not wealthy, and that concerned me as well.

MR. JIMISON: Thank you, Dr. Herman.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Would you like to cross-examine the witness?

MS. GODFREY: Yes, thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:

QDr. Herman, when you -- the information that you got about what was going on with Patient A, you got that not from Patient A, did you?
A

Q You got that from --

A Oh, I'm sorry, excuse me. You'll have to back up. What information are you talking about?

Q You know that was a terrible question.

A It was.

Q Let's all start over.

The information that caused you to file the complaint with the Board --

A Okay.

Q -- you did not obtain that information directly from Patient A, did you?

A No.

Q Okay. The information that you obtained was from her daughter?

A Correct.

Q And from the other employees that are sitting in the back who work in your office?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And after you got the information, I guess you were concerned?

A (Nods head in affirmative response.)

Q Is that -- you have to answer verbally, Doctor?

A Yes, I was concerned.
Okay. But you did not go and talk to Patient A or her family about it, did you?

No, and I'll tell you why I did not. They -- it was just a very tenuous situation. They were having a very difficult time dealing with the fact that Patient A was terminal and I did not want to add to that pain by bringing up this issue at the time.

And Marie was not working at the time. She was going with her mother to these treatment sessions as you've heard, so she was on leave of absence at the time. And as they were gone Monday through Friday every week and so, you know, the weekends were the only time they had at home and I -- I just didn't want to impose upon that.

And even after Patient A died, you didn't go to the family and express any concerns to them, did you?

I had talked with Marie briefly on one occasion and I cannot give you dates or at what point in her treatment that occurred because I do not remember.

But she had come into the office when they were first beginning this treatment and asked me -- walked into my office and said, do you know where I can get concentrated hydrogen peroxide. And I had no clue what she was indicating and I said no and she started to tell me about...
this therapy. And I said, I've never heard of that, Marie, and I don't know what it is.

And then she came by the office again on another occasion and I again expressed to her that I wasn't sure that this was going to be helpful. But I can't give you dates or anything like that.

Well, and the question I asked is that you never went to Patient A or her husband --

No, and I --

Q-- and -- excuse me, can I finish my question?

You never went to Patient A or her husband and said, I have some concerns about the therapy?

No.

Okay. And with regard to Marie, Patient A's daughter, you were only seeing -- she was on leave of absence from your office?

That's correct.

And so I think you testified when I took your deposition that during the time she was treating -- when Patient A was treating with Dr. Buttar, you only saw her maybe two or three times in passing when she would stop by your office for various things --

That's right.
Q-- isn't that right?

You were aware because your office got correspondence from
M.D. Anderson that Patient A had failed her treatments
at M.D. Anderson?

AThat's correct.

QAnd you were also aware that she did not want to give up hope
for trying to do something for her cancer?

AI was aware of that, but most patients are like that.

QOkay. And she never came back to see you --

ANo.

Q-- as a doctor after she returned from M.D. Anderson?

ANo.

QWhen -- when you filed your complaint with the Board, you told
the investigator that you did not believe that Patient
A's family wanted to become involved; isn't that true?

QThat's true.

QAnd you told them, in fact, that you thought that -- that Patient
A's family was content with the care they had received
from Dr. Buttar?

AAt the time I had no reason to think otherwise and so I didn't
offer my opinion on that.

QOkay. And when Mr. Jimison contacted you about being a witness
at this hearing, you told him that Marie Church did not
want to become involved in this, didn't you?
AI did.

MS. GODFREY: Okay. That's all I have.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, do you want to redirect?

MR. JIMISON: Yes.

**REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:**

QDoctor -- Dr. Herman, would you turn to page 38?
AOf what?
QOf Tab 4 of the big thick notebook.

MS. GODFREY: Page 38.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, there are two big thick ones. Are you referring to --
MR. JIMISON: The Board's which is the particular one with four tabs.
MS. GODFREY: The one -- yeah.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: The one with four.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Are you on Tab 4?
ATab 4, I'm sorry. I didn't hear you say Tab 4. Page 38 under Tab 4?
QRight.
AOkay. We're there.
QAll right. Do you recognize that document? It's already been introduced into evidence.
Q: All right. And what is that document?
A: This is a record of Patient A's last visit to M.D. Anderson.

Q: And I turn your attention to the first full paragraph, but it looks like the second paragraph of that -- of that -- of that record.
A: Yes.

Q: What is being done here?
A: Essentially, the physician is telling the patient and the family that there's no other treatment that would be beneficial to her and that she's terminal and they actually recommended hospice.

Q: Okay. There's a sentence there that says the husband was interested in some type of oxygen therapy.
A: Yes.

Q: Would you read that to the Board, please?
A: The husband was interested in some type of oxygen therapy which we do not have available here and I am unaware of any legitimate clinical trials that are being conducted with this approach at this center.

Q: And from your previous testimony we know that M.D. Anderson, in your view, is one of the more progressive and aggressive cancer centers in the country?
MR. KNOX: Objection, it's already been asked about.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yes.

MR. JIMISON: Thank you, Dr. Herman.

WITNESS: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Ms. Godfrey, do you want to recross?

MS. GODFREY: No, thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Are there any Board Members with any questions?

Thank you, Dr. Herman. We appreciate your being here.

MR. JIMISON: At this time, the Board would like to call Dr. John Peterson.

WHEREUPON,

    JOHN L. PETERSON, M.D.,
    being first duly sworn,
    was examined and testified
    as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

Q Dr. Peterson, would you introduce yourself to the Members of the Board, please?

ASure. I'm Dr. John Peterson. I am a hematologist and oncologist. Do you want me to fill in the --
Q: We'll start. And fortunately I have my index switched here. If you could turn to the thin notebook, Exhibit 15 -- no, I'm sorry, Exhibit 7 in the thin notebook.

A: Yeah, okay.

Q: So could you go over your formal medical education and training? 

A: Yeah. I did my undergraduate at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, went to the medical school at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. Did my medical residency at the Medical School of South Carolina in Charleston. Then I was in my public health service payback for two years to help finance medical school. And then academic hematology/oncology fellowship at the University of North Carolina for three years. I spent some of my time at time Duke, I spent of the time at the Fred Hutchison Cancer Research Center in Seattle. Following the conclusion of my fellowship at UNC. I did some additional training in transplant at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. And after that I went into private practice in Sanford and I've been there ever since. I worked for about 7 years until 1999. I also have clinical faculty position at the University of North Carolina and continue to have a clinic appointment at the -- at the Lineberger Cancer Center at
Q: So you are associated with the UNC Cancer Center at the Lineberger Cancer Center?

A: I still have clinical appointment, but I do not actively participate in any work there at all now. Since 1999, I've been in full-time private practice in Sanford.

Q: And prior to that, you had a faculty position at UNC?

A: Yes. And I still have the appointment, but it's really not active.

Q: Are you board certified in any specialties?

A: Hematology and oncology.

Q: And how long have you been board certified?


Q: And do you stay current with your CME?

A: Yes.

Q: Describe some of the things you do to the Board. Describe some of the things that you do to stay current on topics regarding cancer?

A: Well, I subscribe to three journal, the Journal of Clinical Oncology and the Journal of Medicine and the Journal of Cancer. And I go to at least one or two medical meetings a year. I typically go to the meeting at Sloan-Kettering
every fall. The work I do typically puts on review courses both at the hematology meeting and the oncology meeting every summer and I usually go to those. I sometimes go to breast cancer meetings in San Antonio and they'll be other conferences and other meetings that I attend at various times during the year.

Q And do you stay current on your CME hours?

AYes.

QOkay. Describe cancer for us. In my opening statement, I mentioned cancer as a single name. Can you describe what is meant by the word cancer?

AYeah. It's unfortunately a vague term. In general what cancer is, is a growth of -- unregulated cell growth. To make it simply and highball the cell program becomes a certain size and it stops growing, but cancer cells are cells that have lost the signal and they just grow and form tumors that get in the blood stream and lymphatic system and migrate through the body and lodge and form more tumors and you just simply lost the mechanisms that normal -- normal cells have.

QAre all cancers the same?

ANO. In fact, one of the biggest problems we are having in cancer is that it's getting -- it's becoming increasingly
-- I guess depressingly clear that finding a treatment for cancer is going to be really a question of finding thousands of treatments for thousands of cancers. Even a disease like breast cancer, what you'll find is there's really hundreds if not thousands of these cancers. I mean, there was a recent report where they just took one patient's cancer cells and in that tumor they found they could separate cells and they couldn't find any cells that actually had identical genetic mutations. When they got down to that level, what they find is there is no such thing as just breast cancer. You know, we've tried to cut and slice and cut and slice. I mean, when I first started to study lymphoma there were three kinds of lymphomas, there's over 30 now and under those 30 names, each one of those will have a whole list of molecular mutations that further subdivide them to the point that, you know, it's just a tremendous effort. And it's made -- it's one of the things that made such different cancer disease or diseases so difficult to treat.

MR. JIMISON: At this point, I'd like to tender Dr. Peterson as an expert in the treatment of cancer, oncology and hematology.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Without objection, accepted.
Q (By Mr. Jimison) Describe -- you touched on this, but describe
the research that goes on in the battle against cancer.
Describe what kind of research goes on today.
AYou want it like drug development research or --
QSure, start with that.
AWell, I guess clinically that's what we see. Of course, in
the molecular level there's all kinds of research done
at the lab level.
But at the clinical level, you know, they'll find a
substance in the lab that looks like it has anti-tumor
activity in the cell line. There's a whole screen of these
cells lines and now we can kind of standardize for
experimental treatment. There's lung cancer cell lines
and colon cancer cell lines and breast cancer cell lines
and were derived from patients with cancer.
And they can set up a million miles where they can actually
get these cancers to grow in rats or mice and then try
these various substances that they found in test tubes
to see what kind of effect they have on a system such as
a rat or a mouse.
And then they get pre-clinical data in the animal studies,
they will then move forward with what's called the Phase
I study and the patients have a hard time understanding
that.

The Phase I study really doesn't necessarily benefit the patient because at that point all you're doing in a Phase I study is trying to see what the appropriate dose in a human is and what the toxicity in a human is. Now, sometimes the drugs work well in some of those patients on a Phase I trial and will actually get some benefit, but there's no promissory intention of benefit with the Phase I trial. It's just an attempt to go literally from the rat to the human and see are these drugs safe, what's the toxicity, what would be the appropriate dose in a human.

In a Phase I trial they're typically not targeting a typical tumor. You know, a typical or any tumor and list a bunch of their failed standard therapy in which standard therapies are unavailable and with informed consent the patient can consent to go on these trials, but it's made quite clear to them that these are experimental. After the Phase I, if they get good data, they're safe and they got the appropriate dose and it's all under FDA approval, they can then, after approval, move forward for a Phase II trial.

And throughout all of these trials, these have to go through
something called an Institutional Review Board and every single institution would offer it. It's not just -- because if UNC wants to do a trial that's offered at Duke, it has to go through the UNC Institution Review Board and it has to be okayed and it's a panel of people. There's lay people, there's oncologists, and surgeons on it and get the data and feel it's ethical, they'll have permission from IRB to do the trial and offer it to patients. If the Phase I approves, they can go back to the FDA and NIH and get permission to go on to Phase II and then they have to design the trial.

And, again, the Phase II, it's the same IRB that Phase I went through to make sure they are safe and appropriate, the consent form is ethical, the patients have been given a chance to understand what they're signing on to. At Phase II you start to get some true clinical information where you'll actually know if it's working. Not only have they got the doses down, possibly more patients on it now, and you'll start seeing more side effects and you got more data. And at that point it's usually when you hope to get somebody of which tumors this is most active on. From there you'll go to a Phase III trial, again through the same regulatory standards. You have to show the data.
And in a Phase III trial is where you're actually now offering treatment benefit potentially. At this point you've got data, it's working in these cancers. This is the approximate response and you're going to compare it then to standard therapy. At that portion of the trial, the patient can go to the university or even at some private offices and you can get standard therapy for the trial. And the hope is the new drugs or drug or drugs are superior to the old ones. And it would be a randomized trial in which you'll have an opportunity to compare the standard therapy to the new therapy and you'll found out which one is superior. And after that it goes back to the FDA and they get approval for the regimen.

QIn these -- these new drugs that are developed through this -- through these clinical trials and the different stages, what are some of the safeguards that are used in such research?

AWell, they'll have these data monitoring boards -- and I don't really do this work any more, so I'm probably somewhat out of date.

But they'll have data monitoring boards and this data has
to be really -- at certain intervals depending on the trial -- if there's any -- and there's -- the physicians that have patients on these trials are required to report any -- any adverse reaction. There's a form they fill out. Any adverse reaction that's reported is immediately investigated. If there's any indication there's a problem, a trial can be halted by the state or city monitoring committee. And in addition to that, all of these institutions are monitored by the NIH and they come down a couple of times a years, they withdraw the data on all the patients to make sure that they aren't having what are called protocol violation. You can't increase the dose or decrease the dose, very rigid criteria, for the cancer could affect blood counts with treatment and you're required mandatory reductions based on the blood counts and make sure that you are dose reducing appropriately or dose delaying appropriately or recording adverse events appropriately.

Does that answer --

QWell, why are -- why are they necessary? That's -- why are these safeguards necessary?

AWell, you don't want to be giving unnecessary treatments.
You want -- you don't want to be offering patients treatments that do not have proven benefit. And the FDA is in business in approving drugs only if they have a proven benefit.

QOkay. And I'd now like to turn your attention to Patients A, B, C and D. Okay. Did you review those records for the Medical Board?

AYes, I did.

QAnd do you have an opinion to a reasonable degree of medical certainty as to whether the treatment provided by Dr. Buttar to Patients A, B, C and D -- well, let's just go for A, B and C, to Patients A, B and C was within acceptable prevailing standards of medical practice for the treatment of cancer in North Carolina?

MR. KNOX: Objection.

MS. GODFREY: Objection.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: What is the basis?

MR. KNOX: The basis of my objection, he's qualified as hematology/oncologist and not as an integrative doctor and if I need to, I can at this point, but there's no evidence to show to the Board that he has qualifications in his deposition that says he knew nothing about alternative medicine or integrative medicine.
MR. JIMISON: This is a good point for me to respond to Mr. Knox. The law in North Carolina and I'll read it to you, is 90-14(a)(6) and during the closing arguments we argued this case to the Medical Board, we'll be stressing this and this is important.

It says under the disciplinary authority of the Board 90-14(a)(6), it says: Unprofessional conduct, including, but not limited to, departure from, or the failure to conform to the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice, or the ethics of the medical profession, irrespective of whether or not a patient is injured thereby, or the committing of any act contrary to honesty, justice, or good morals, whether the same is committed in the course of the physician's practice or otherwise, and whether committed within or without North Carolina.

They're saying that you have to conform to acceptable and prevailing standards of medical practice and that the label you put on your -- the doctor, the doctor's label is irrelevant. It is totally irrelevant. You have to conform to acceptable and prevailing medical practices for the disease that you're treating. That's the law. Here and with your permission, Dr. Rhyne, I will hand up
the Supreme Court case, In Re: Guess.

MS. GODFREY: I've got a copy.

MR. JIMISON: In the In Re: Guess case, the North Carolina Supreme Court was confronted head on with the argument that Dr. Guess who was practicing what's called homeopathy and could be judged only by homeopathic standards, that in order for the Board to judge him, he had -- the Board had to have other homeopaths come in and testify that there has to be a homeopathic standard and he can only be charged with -- he can only be judged under the homeopathic standard.

The In Re: Guess said, that, no, the statute permitting the revocation of a physician's medical license for unprofessional conduct based on acts which do not concern -- which do not conform to the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice in North Carolina.

They're just saying, you have to conform to acceptable and prevailing medical practices in North Carolina. That is the law.

This case has never been overturned.

Subsequent to the Guess case, the North Carolina General Assembly added the following language to the statute.
And that statute is that the Board shall not revoke the license or deny a license to a person solely because of that person's practice of a therapy that is experimental, non-traditional, or that departs from acceptable and prevailing medical practice, unless by competent evidence the Board can establish that the treatment had a safety risk greater than the prevailing treatment or that the treatment is generally ineffective.

What the General Assembly is saying is that you have the right to regulate the practice of medicine so long as it's -- so long as it's outside, it departs from acceptable and prevailing practices.

What you can't do is revoke the license unless you make a finding that it's generally ineffective or has a safety risk. They tie the integrative medicine standard to the penalty. That's the law as it exists right now.

So what you have to decide are, what are the acceptable and prevailing medical treatments in North Carolina for the treatment of cancer. You take the patient, the standard is -- is pointed to the patient and what the patient has and what the patient is being treated for.

You can't slap a label -- a doctor can't slap a label on himself and say I'm outside the rules now. The statute
does not say that. The George -- the In Re: George Guess, Dr. Guess case does not say that.
The only thing that has changed is that before the Board can revoke a license, they have to make certain findings.

Now, Dr. Peterson will also testify as to the other findings about whether it's generally effective or whether it -- or has a safety risk that's greater than the prevailing treatment, so he's qualified to testify to both.
But the law in North Carolina under this Guess case and under the way the statute is written right now, is that you only determine what are the prevailing and acceptable medical standards in North Carolina for the treatment of what the patient has.
That's what the law is and that law -- the Guess case has never been overturned and this law as you're aware of, because we did a wholesale revision to the Medical Practice Act just a year or so ago where we added additional disciplinary options. You know, we can do public letters of concern, we can do censures, we can do fines.
So when they changed that act, they left this sentence in the law saying that, you know, still that tieing the integrative medicine standard or actually it's not
integrative medicine standards, this 90-14(a)(6) in the
disciplinary authority doesn't even use the word
integrative.
It just says before you can revoke a license that departs
from acceptable and prevailing medical practice, you have
to make a finding of whether or not it's generally
ineffective or it has a safety -- a greater safety risk,
but you can still regulate. You can still regulate the
medicine.
The other part of the argument would be that if you cannot
do that, then everything goes. Then everything goes no
matter what goes -- I mean, no matter what happens in a
doctor's office, everything goes so long as, you know,
the doctor can say, well, it's not hurting anyone or I
have some effect.
The General Assembly did not say that. They only tied
it to revocation. So -- so the argument that there is --
there is a standard for all other doctors and there's a
different standard for integrative doctors is not
supported by the statute. It's not supported by the In
Re: Guess case.
And so the objection is -- is completely incorrect. It
is just a totally incorrect statement of the law under
the statute and under that In Re: Guess case.
And so therefore I think the qualification for Dr. Peterson
to testify what are the acceptable and prevailing medical
standards in North Carolina for the treatment of cancer
is well within his authority, well within his expertise
and well within the law. In fact, it is the law. So that's
how I would respond to that objection.

MS. GODFREY: With all due respect to Mr. Jimison, I think
he has misquoted the Guess case, first of all. The Guess
case deals with the issue of -- of whether or not there
has to be -- there has to be a showing of harm to the patient
and it's back in 1990 and it went through the courts several
times and finally the Supreme Court said that you can revoke
a doctor's license without showing that they've harmed
the patient. That's the holding of the Guess case.
The Guess case does not address this issue of standard
of care and there's been a lot of evolution in the law
since 1990 on the issue of standard of care. We are not
saying that integrative medicine doctors need -- need to
be judged under a special rule.
What we are saying is, is that the Medical Practice Act
and the law of North Carolina is that you judge the standard
of care by a doctor with same or similar training.
We are familiar in the medical malpractice arena that a general practice doctor cannot be held to the same standard of care for diagnosis and treatment of any condition as a neurosurgeon or any other kind of specialist. And what we are saying is the way the Medical Malpractice Act is structured and the way the law of North Carolina is structured and the way those words are interpreted under the law of North Carolina, you have to judge each medical specialty by the standards of care of that medical specialty. It only makes sense. And what we are saying is that although Dr. Peterson may be well qualified to judge the conduct of an oncologist treating cancer, we do not believe that he is well qualified to judge the conduct of Dr. Buttar who is not an oncologist, who is a doctor practicing integrative medicine which is defined by the statute and recognized by the statute as the diagnosis or therapeutic treatment that may not be a conventionally accepted medical treatment. By it's very definition, integrative medicine is outside Dr. Peterson's standard of care because Dr. Peterson treats patients under the conventionally accepted medical practice. And that's fine, but sometimes the conventionally accepted medical practice fails.
And what we're saying is that patients have a right to seek an integrative medicine doctor who practices outside conventionally accepted medical practice and that doctor's right to practice his type of medicine ought to be protected the same as Dr. Peterson's is. And so for that -- that's the basis of our objection to him testifying against this doctor.

They don't have another expert. They don't have an integrative doctor here, they have an oncologist and he has an opinion and he's entitled to that opinion, but his opinions should not be the standard upon which we judge Dr. Buttar because he's in a different field.

MR. JIMISON: If I can just respond quickly to that because I handed the case out to you and if I can draw the Board's attention to just some of the language in the case, I think it would be very instructive. If you can turn to page 5, to what's called Head Note 1. I've highlighted it on my copy so you can follow along.

MS. GODFREY: What page are you on, Marcus?

MR. JIMISON: Page 5.

MS. GODFREY: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And I can give you a copy of mine. It's Headnote 1. It says -- and this is the North Carolina
Supreme Court talking. The provision of the statute in question here is reasonably related to the public health.

We conclude that the Legislature in enacting 90-14(a)(6) -- for which Dr. Buttar has been charged with -- reasonably believe that a general risk of endangering the public is inherent -- and it quotes and italicized -- any practices which fail to form to the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice in North Carolina.

We further conclude that the legislative intent was to prohibit any practice departing from acceptable and prevailing medical standards without regard to whether the particular practice itself could be shown to endanger the public.

Our conclusions are buttressed by the plain language of the statute which allows the Board to act against -- and again it italicizes it -- any departure from acceptable and medical practice irrespective of whether or not a patient is injured thereby.

By authorizing the Board -- and this is a Medical Board case -- they're talking about this Medical Board. By authorizing the Board to prevent or punish any medical practice departing from acceptable or prevailing standards, irrespective of whether a patient is thereby
injured or injured thereby, a statute works as a regulation which tends to secure the public generally against the consequences of ignorance, in any capacity, as well as deception and fraud, even though it may not immediately have that direct effect in this particular case. Therefore, the statute is a valid exercise of the police power.

If you turn over to Page 6 on the second column and this is Dr. Guess arguing that, well, he's a homeopathic doctor, he should be judged only by homeopathic standards. It says: Dr. Guess strenuously argues that many countries and at least three states recognize --

MS. GODFREY: Excuse me, Marcus. We have a different version of the -- of the case than you do. Can -- can you give me your version because we can't follow where you're -- you're on page 6?

MR. JIMISON: Uh-huh (yes).

MS. GODFREY: At what headnote?

MR. JIMISON: Number 4, second column, midway down where it says, Dr. Guess strenuously.

It says: Dr. Guess strenuously argues that many countries and at least three states recognize the legitimacy of homeopathy.
While some physicians may value the homeopathic system of practice, it seems that others consider homeopathy an outmoded and ineffective system of practice. This conflict however interesting, simply is irrelevant here in light of the uncontroverted evidence in the Board's findings and conclusions that homeopathy is not currently an acceptable and prevailing system of medical practice in North Carolina.

While questions as to the effectiveness of homeopathy and whether its practice should be allowed in North Carolina may be open to valid debate among members of the medical profession, the courts are not the proper forum for that debate.

Then Ms. Godfrey talked about, well, patients should be able to have the right to chose whatever treatment they get outside of conventional standards.

If you turn to page 7, the Supreme Court addressed this issue very much as well. Headnote 6, right before you get to -- in the second column right before you get to Head Note 7, it's kind of up here. It says -- well, I actually have to start -- it starts at the very bottom of the first paragraph on Headnote 6.

It says: Regarding Dr. Guess's claim that the Board's
decision invades his patient's right to select a treatment of their choice, we initially note that he has no standing to raise his patient's privacy interest in this regard.

The most -- the next sentence is the most important, after you get through the cites of cases.

Further, we have recognized no -- no fundamental right to receive unorthodox medical treatment and we decline to do so now. There is no right to seek any kind of treatment you want from anybody, any time, anywhere in North Carolina.

That's the law in Dr. Guess's case. It was a Medical Board case. It's from 1990. It's never been overturned. The statute has the exact same language as it did then.

The only change has been is that when we get to Phase II, if there is a Phase II and the Board decides they want to revoke Dr. Buttar's license, then and only then does it become relevant as to the two findings that you have to make about whether it poses a greater safety risk or whether it's generally ineffective. Both factors can be addressed by Dr. Peterson.

And there's nowhere in this case that says that specialties can only testify against other specialties and
non-specialties or this specialty.

They're talking about what are acceptable and prevailing treatments for patients in North Carolina. So if a patient comes to a doctor with cancer, what is the acceptable and prevailing treatment for cancer for that doctor. And if that doctor is of a specialty, he still has to treat it within those acceptable standards of care. So --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm going to overturn this objection.

Mr. Jimison, if you would proceed.

MS. GODFREY: Okay.

MR. KNOX: Would you reserve us an objection to every time the question is asked or we can just notify the court reporter as we go through, if that's okay, without interrupting?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: That'll be fine.

MR. JIMISON: I agree to that.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Okay. Dr. Peterson, do you remember the question?

ANO, I don't.

QLet me rephrase the question. Let me re-ask the question. Do you have an opinion as to whether the treatments provided by Dr. Buttar to Patients A, B and C were within acceptable
and prevailing standards of -- wait a minute.
Do you have an opinion to a reasonable degree of medical
certainty as to whether the treatment provided by Dr.
Buttar to Patients A, B and C was within acceptable and
prevailing standards of medical practice for the treatment
of cancer in North Carolina?

AYes.

QAnd what is that opinion?

AThat they were below the standard.

QOkay. Do you have an opinion as to whether the treatment
provided by Dr. Buttar to Patient D was within acceptable
and prevailing medical standards of --

MR. KNOX: Objection.

Q-- of medical practice?

AWWhich one is D?

QThe non-cancer patient?

AYes.

QAnd what is that?

AIt was below the standard.

QOkay. Going back to Patients A, B and C, why is it your opinion
that the treatment that was provided by Dr. Buttar in these
three patients was below the standard of care?

AWell, he gave them treatment that had no proven benefit in
cancer. There's no clinical trial ever published that's shown ozone or hydrogen peroxide therapy or chelation for heavy metals has any effect -- has any known effect at all on cancer or the patient's life.

Q Dr. Peterson, if you could turn to the exhibits in the thin notebook, to Exhibit 6.

MS. GODFREY: Exhibit, I'm sorry, what?

MR. JIMISON: Exhibit 6.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Do you recognize those documents?

AYeah. I think these are the -- these are my notes and my -- the form I filled out from the review of the charts.

Q You reviewed the medical cases for the -- for the Medical Board and you filled out forms, correct?

ACorrect.

Q And these are these forms.

ACorrect.

Q And you sent in a cover letter regarding your forms to Mr. Ellis, the director of investigations?

AThat's correct.

Q Are these a true and accurate copy of the documents that you sent to the Medical Board?

AYes.

MR. JIMISON: At this point, Dr. Rhyne, I'd like to enter
the Medical Board's Exhibit 6 into evidence.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Proceed.

MR. KNOX: We have the same objection as it includes his opinions.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So noted.

MR. KNOX: Thank you.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Okay. As to Patient A, Dr. Peterson, what did -- what did patient -- what was Patient A's diagnosis? Assuming that's the patient that has ovarian cancer, if it's the same one I'm looking at.

Q Yes.

A Okay.

MS. GODFREY: No, Patient A had cervical cancer.

MR. JIMISON: Okay.

WITNESS: That's the second one.

MR. JIMISON: Yes.

WITNESS: Yeah, they're not labeled A in here. Patient A had cervical cancer.

Q Patient A would be -- the last name starts with an O.

A Yeah. What was the question again?

A What -- what was her diagnosis?

A Well, cervical cancer, metastases.

Q And what treatments did she receive from Dr. Buttar from your
review of the records?

AI'd have to pull this chart. I think -- I think he gave her -- I don't -- my recollection is the chelation therapy and hydrogen peroxide. I'd have to look in the records.

QOkay. And Tab 4 in the big notebook under Tab 4.

AAll of this is the records of Patient A?

QYes, sir.

ALEt me see. The flow sheets. It looks like vitamin C, GSH and hydrogen peroxide, something called adrenal 5 cc, something called PALT amino, EDTA, that is chelation treatment I believe, something called HZM1, DMPS, adrenal.

I'm not sure what that is over there. And then something I can't read -- I can't read that. Scratched out and written over. It looks like it has been scratched out. And then there's something that looks like WFAM, SM2. It looks like that's what she was treated with.

QPatient B with the last name starts with K.

AOkay.

QWhat was her diagnosis?

AMetastatic ovarian cancer.

QOkay. And -- and she would be in Tab 3.

AOkay.

QAnd just look -- maybe I can speed things along. Does it appear
that she received the same therapies as Patient A?

MS. GODFREY: What exhibit are you in?

MR. JIMISON: Tab 3.

AThe vitamin C, GCH, DMPS, so and so and so and so, EDTA, MSP.

Yeah, it looks more about the same. Hydrogen peroxide here, vitamin C --

QOzone?

AYeah, it looks like the same.

QOkay. And Patient A, what was Patient A's diagnosis?

AWhat was that?

QIt ends with K-E. It's the middle patient.

AOkay. Adrenal cell cancer.

QOkay. And the therapies and he would be in Tab -- Tab 2.

Did he get the same as those previous Patients A and B?

AYeah, has vitamin C and DMSP, yeah, DMPS, PSH and it looks like ozone. Yeah, it looks like the same treatment.

QOkay. The hydrogen peroxide for Patient B as well?

AYes.

QThese treatments, hydrogen peroxide, ozone, EDTA, DMPS, vitamin C, are any of these -- hyperbaric chambers, are any of these therapies indicative for the treatment of cancer?

ANO.
Q: Do you use any of these therapies in your practice?
A: No.

Q: Are you aware of any oncologists or cancer doctors using any of these therapies in their practice?
A: No.

Q: Now, turn to again Exhibit 6 in the thin notebook.
A: All right, I'm there.

Q: If you could turn to your cover sheet -- your cover letter.
A: Yeah.

Q: You wrote -- starting with the paragraph beside. Do you see that paragraph?
A: Yeah, the third one down.

Q: Could you read that to the Board Members, please?
A: Yeah. Beside the obvious fallacy of using EDTA, chromium and co-enzyme-Q, etcetera, to treat cancer patients which in my opinion is clearly rank fraud, there is the issue that none of these people were being managed for their other medical problems, as evidenced by the lack of physician involvement.

Q: Rank fraud is kind of a strong term, Dr. Peterson. Why did you use that term?
A: Well, because these people are being offered treatments that
don't work, to me it suggested fraud. I mean, it's
dishonest. It tells someone you've got treatment when,
in fact, it has no effect.

QCould -- did these patients who went through the diagnosis --
at some point, did they all become Stage IV metastatic
cancer patients?

AYeah, they were all Stage IV when they presented to Dr. Buttar's
office.

QWe spoke earlier on and then we had sort of a thing with --
with the lawyers arguing in front of the Medical Board,
but I'd like to draw your attention back to that earlier
testimony about clinical trials.
Have any of these therapies that you have reviewed for
the Medical Board for Patients A, B and C, have any of
them been proven effective in any clinical trials that
you're aware of?

MR. KNOX: Well, objection. He -- at that deposition,
he referred to and said he didn't know what any of these
medications were. I don't know how you presuppose he would
know what's been tested or not been tested. He cannot
identify any of them.

MR. JIMISON: I think Dr. Peterson should answer his own --
the question instead of --
MR. KNOX: Well, I'm making an objection and I --

MR. JIMISON: I mean, Mr. Knox is answering the question for Dr. Peterson.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Are you aware of any clinical trials --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You can answer.

MR. JIMISON: Okay.

Q Are you aware of any clinical trials that have shown that any of these therapies have proven effective for cancer?

MR. KNOX: Objection.

A No, I'm not. And I would know about them because alternative therapies that are -- trials that are done through the NIH are published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology. In fact, there have been numerous ones published and none of these have.

Q What are some of the alternative medicine therapies that have been published as a result of clinical trials?

A One of them is called shark cartilage and we actually tried it for a while and there was -- the National Cancer Center does have an office of alternative medicine trials and they do, in fact, do trials in alternative medicine just because of all the pressure.

And the initial trials showed there's about a 15 percent response rate to shark cartilage and I actually had some
patients that would go and buy it. It's not a prescription
drug. You can buy it from the GNC Nutrition Stores. But
subsequently the clinical trials showed it was a failure.

Q So clinical -- there are people who do -- who treat cancer
and do research cancer for conducting clinical trials
regarding alternative therapies, correct?

A That's correct. And there's another one actually, I forgot
about this. There was herbal supplement in China. It
was initially called PCC but they changed the name and
right now I forgot what they call it now. But it -- it's
an interesting story if you care about it.

Q Sure.

A There was a research scientist in Los Angeles whose father
had prostate cancer and they were Chinese-American and,
you know, stating there was a working association linked
to China and she went to China and she came back -- and
in fact her father responded and because of that fact she
ran -- (inaudible) -- and in fact works and it's not a
prescription drug, but it is available and patients can
buy it and I have prescribed it to patients.

We think the reason it works is because it actually contains
Coumadin or -- (inaudible) -- Coumadin, the blood thinner.

Well, Coumadin actually does have anti-tumor effect.
In fact, back when I was a fellow at the University of Kentucky, they had a clinical trial using Coumadin to treat cancer. There are some responses but the responses are poor, but that's probably why that herbal supplement works.

So, yeah, they do do trials on these things and when they work, we are going to use them. As though the chairman of the oncology at the Virginia of Medicine, Charles Smith has a whole clinic up there and he's had quite a few experiments with using herbal supplements for prostate cancer and he's got proven clinical results in that showing that the clinical trials do work.

Q Okay. Are you familiar with the American Cancer Society?
A Yes.
Q Have -- are you familiar with whether they may have taken a position regarding the recommendation of oxygen therapy for cancer patients?
A My understanding is, yeah, they've said it does not work and should not be used.
Q Are you familiar with the Sloan-Kettering Memorial Institute?
A Yes.
Q What is Sloan-Kettering?
A It's a -- it's a cancer research treatment hospital in New
York City. It's actually was founded by Alfred Sloan, who was the head of General Motors and Kettering was Charles Kettering. I don't know if you care about this, but he was the guy who invented the first electric-started Cadillac in 1912 and they gave the money and started Sloan-Kettering Memorial Cancer Center in New York City.

QWhat's its reputation for cancer research and cancer treatment in the country?

AWell, it's outstanding. It's one of the leading cancer centers in the world.

QHas it taken a position regarding oxygen therapies, that you know of?

AI'm not aware of it.

QIf you could turn to Exhibit 19.

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection. He's just said he's not familiar with Sloan-Kettering's position on oxygen therapy and we would object to Number 19. It's not going to --

MR. JIMISON: I can ask him to review the document.

MS. GODFREY: Well, I guess he could, but we would object under the Rules of Evidence that if he's not familiar with it, he's not entitled to testify to it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So he cannot testify to it, but he can examine it.
MR. JIMISON: No. He can examine the document and under Rule 803, if Ms. Godfrey is not familiar with Rule 803, expert witnesses can testify to medical references that they consider authoritative. And -- and I can bring you that rule.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) In fact, I hate to have you go back and forth, but -- while we're doing this, Dr. Peterson, can you just review Exhibit 19?

AYeah, sure. It's the same document I was referring to before.

The American Cancer Society urges cancer patients not to seek treatment with hydrogen peroxide, ozone therapy, or other, quote, hyperoxygenation therapies. Oxygen therapies should not be recommended.

MR. KNOX: That's means he testified while you were looking up the rule.

MR. JIMISON: Well, let me -- let me just -- I'll move on. I don't want to --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Just -- just move on.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Do you recommend oxygen therapy to your patients?

ANo.

QWhy not?

ABecause it doesn't work.
Q: And is Dr. Buttar using these therapies to treat cancer from your review of the records --
A: He was in these three patients, yes.
Q: What are some of the risks associated with Dr. Buttar's therapies?
A: Well, I don't know if there's -- I don't know of any risks. The biggest -- I don't know if there is any risk so much as the downside as you're sitting there 40 hours a week in a chair and wasting your time and your money on something that's going to be for no good and you've lost all that time.
Q: From your review of the charts, who seemed to be the primary caregiver to these patients?
A: The nurses.
Q: Did you see physician contact between Dr. Buttar and the patients in the charts?
A: I couldn't see any that was documented. It doesn't mean that it didn't happen, but I could not find any in the records that I was provided.
Q: Did you see the number of labs that Dr. Buttar ordered?
A: Yes.
Q: Could you characterize them as a small amount of labs or a large amount of labs? How would you characterize them?
A: It was a lot of labs. Most of them made no sense to me. I don't know what the purpose of checking them was. I mean, there was some legitimate chemistry labs that made sense, but a lot of them were in my opinion just bogus labs.

Q: Was there any evidence in the record that any of these lab tests were indicative for a cancer diagnosis?

A: Well, no. I mean, he had some the standard chemistry which you would monitor anybody getting any kind of therapy, the creatinine and those sorts of things.

Q: If you could speak up a little bit, Doctor. I think -- I'm having trouble hearing you and I think the Board --

A: If I look up you can't, so I have to talk to this thing.

There were standard blood tests you monitor now on any patient, just renal function tests and, you know, glucose and certain whatnot, but then there were all these other tests, aluminum levels, antimony, arsenic levels, beryllium, bismuth, cadmium, lead, mercury levels and I mean, these have nothing to do with cancer.

Q: Was there any evidence in the records that you reviewed that any of these tests were linked to clinical decisions?

A: If it was, I couldn't see it.

Q: Was there any evidence in the records that any of the tests were even interpreted by Dr. Buttar himself?
ANot that I could see in the record, no.

QDid you review the cost of these treatments?

ANo, I did not.

QOkay. Turning to Patient D, did you see -- the non-cancer patient, did you see physician contact between Dr. Buttar and Patient D?

ANo. No, not that I recall, no.

QAnd from your review of the record, could you discern whether Dr. Buttar made a diagnosis for Patient D?

AWell, my recollection is that it looked like he came in for constipation although I heard earlier today -- (inaudible).

QIf you could speak up, sir.

MR. KNOX: I cannot hear a word.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah, I couldn't hear that either.

AFrom my -- this thing is not working. I can tell you I feel like I'm yelling here.

My recollection of the chart was that she came there for consultation, but I had heard earlier today they disputed that she come for lead toxicity, but I did not see that reflected in the record that I reviewed.

QOkay. Is there any evidence in the record that Dr. Buttar personally made a treatment plan for Patient D?
A
Not that I could see.
QYou mentioned -- how were people tested for metal toxicity in all four of these patients?
AWith urine tests.
QDo you have -- what is the standard for measuring metal toxicity in a patient?
AYou measure serum levels. Urine levels have -- do not necessarily mimic at all. For instance, if you would check -- the simplest example I can give you, and that is we check urine for protein. People with all kinds of renal problems will have elevated proteins in their urine. We cannot conclude they've got too much protein based on that, but the conclusion is the kidneys are wasting the protein.
So what's in your urine is not an accurate way to diagnose a toxicity of mercury or lead or iron. If you want to know those levels you measure the serum levels.
QDo you consider urine -- urine screening for toxicity reliable?
ANo.
QIn your opinion as a physician doing hematology and oncology, what is the standard test for metal measuring toxicity in a human?
AIT's the serum test.
MS. GODFREY: Objection.

Q Okay. We discussed earlier on in the discussion between counsel whether there are acceptable and prevailing standards of medical practice for the treatment of cancer and I want to go back to those cancer patients. In your opinion, is there a universal standard for what's acceptable and prevailing for the treatment of cancer?

A Yes.

Q And what is that -- what is that standard?

MS. GODFREY: Objection.

A Well, it would depend on the cancer as to what the standard is. But say ovarian cancer, the treatment for what she received which is chemotherapy, carboplatin, cisplatin, Taxol base chemotherapy. If those don't work, second line therapies are things like Taxol, thoracine, taxon tier, gypsum, (phonetic) and combinations. There's also work done with intraperitoneal cisplatin and peritoneal -- (inaudible).

Q Okay. Now, going back to what Dr. Buttar administered, hydrogen peroxide specifically. Is hydrogen peroxide therapy within the acceptable and prevailing standards of treatment for cancer patients in North Carolina?

A No.
QHave you known hydrogen peroxide to have been proven effective in any clinical trial?

ANo.

QOn a scale from zero to 10, 10 being a cure, that the treatment provides a cure for patients for cancer and zero being they have zero effect whatsoever, what -- how would you rate hydrogen peroxide therapy on a scale from zero to 10 for -- for cancer?

AZero.

QAnd when I say cancer, I mean, all three cancers that these patients had, adrenal, liver, lung, ovarian, cervical. Is it still a zero for all those cancers?

AIt would be a zero for all of them, yes.

QWhat about the ozone, on a scale from zero to 10, what effect does it have on cancer?

AZero.

QVitamin -- intravenous vitamin C?

AZero.

QIV minerals?

AZero.

QTrigger point injections?

AZero.

QIs trigger point injections specifically called an IRR?
ARight. It has no efficacy.

MR. KNOX: Objection, he also testified he never heard of that.

MR. JIMISON: That can be argued. That's not a basis for an objection.

WITNESS: Actually, if I could address the issue. If you refer to it as an IRR as a trigger point, I know what that is. It wasn't referred to as a trigger point.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Hyperbaric chambers, what -- on a scale from zero to 10, how effective is that for cancer?

A Zero.

Q Chelation therapy, EDTA and EMPS, on a scale from zero to 10, how effective is that for cancer?

A Zero.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. I have nothing further.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

Q Doctor, looking at your vitae, it appears that you are the sole practitioner down in Sanford; is that correct?

A Well, I'm -- no, I have a part-time doctor, Dr. Kirby who is now in Chapel Hill.

Q And Dr. Kirby is a doctor with who?

A She works with me.

Q Okay. But basically you run -- you run two separate offices,
do you?

A No, I just run my office in Sanford.

Q And I looked at your -- according to your resume, you're not doing any research now, correct?

A No, that's correct.

Q And you've not taught since 1999; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And you've had two publications listed, one is an abstract and a book review, both from 1991; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And you've not published any reviews or articles at any place since then?

A That's correct.

Q And have you presented or lectured at a national or international conference on cancer anywhere?

A No, I have not.

Q And I believe you were asked about, you have not been to any particular Integrative Medicine Society meetings; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And there are no integrative doctors when you were presented down there?

A There is a guy down there. I've forgotten his name now. At
one point -- I think he's still down there, but I'm not sure -- I had very little contact --

Q: But he has never sat down to talk with you --
A: No.

Q: -- or any other integrative doctors about alternative treatments, have you?
A: No.

Q: As I gather, you're a medical hematologist and oncologist? Did I say it right?
A: That's correct.

Q: And as a rule you don't treat cervical cancer?
A: No, we do, but what will happen is most GYN oncologists don't give chemotherapy, some do, but typically treatment is sending them to -- ask the medical oncologist to give the chemotherapy. But when I treat, it's always in conjunction with a GYN oncologist and the radiation oncologist.

Q: So you always have somebody else and you do the chemotherapy, is that what it is?
A: That would be correct, yeah.

Q: That's basically what you do, you do chemotherapy on cancer patients. Is that a fair statement?
A: Well, in cancer patients, but I also do a lot of hematology.
Of course, it's not --

Q: We'll talk about it in just a minute.

How may -- how frequently do you treat ovarian cancer?

A: Well, I probably see a half a dozen or a dozen cases a year.

Q: And how about adrenal cancer?

A: They're uncommon and I probably treated a half a dozen in the last ten years.

Q: So you don't see many as a rule, correct?

A: No, nobody does. It's a very uncommon tumor.

Q: In taking your deposition you talked a lot about you use chemotherapy, but don't you use many experimental drugs? Is that correct?

A: No, when a patient needs experimental drugs, I typically refer them to Duke.

Q: Okay. And you don't use radiation, you send those people out?

A: Right. I'm not a radiation oncologist.

Q: So basically what you do is you either diagnose cancer and treat it with chemotherapy in your office and you do some hematology work as well?

A: That's correct.

Q: Okay. Talking about the cost of medical treatment, I believe you said it's about $5 million a year that goes through your office; is that correct?
AYeah, that being overhead plus wholesale costs.

QOkay. And then you add to that your labor or whatever you charge seeing people?

ARight.

QHow many people would you see a year, Doctor, 300 maybe?

AAre you referring to new patients?

QWell, let's talk about it. How many -- what's your patient inventory? If I walked in today how many new patients and old patients would you see?

AI'm not sure I -- you mean, per day, per year, per month?

QPer day, per month, per year.

AI see roughly 300 new consults a year.

QAnd so you have $5 million worth of drug costs that goes through that office, plus whatever labor costs you have, plus whatever the value of your services are; is that correct?

AThat would be correct.

QSo cancer treatment is a very expensive thing in its own right, am I right? That's a fair statement?

AThat's very fair and they're going up. If you care about this, my drug costs in 1998, the same office, the same set up, $750,000 a year; in 2007 it hit a $4.9 million. To give an example of the rate of inflation in cancer care, that's correct.
Q: And is that at the Sanford office or -- where is the other doctor? Does she practice there?
A: She practices in my office in Sanford.
Q: And in -- and where? You said she practices where?
A: In my office in Sanford. She also has a research lab at UNC.
Q: I beg your pardon. When did she come with you, recently?
A: She's been -- I'm going to say since 2003.
Q: You had one doctor recently leave you; is that right?
A: No. I worked for a while with Dr. Mark Graham in Cary and the three of us ran two offices, but I ended that relationship I'm going to say two years ago.
Q: Okay, I'm sorry. So the two doctors -- I believe you said you were getting 1099s out the ying-yang and that means it's very expensive to treat cancer.
A: It's very expensive.
Q: And I read where there's maybe 240 different cancers. Have you read that?
A: There's over 2,000 in the textbook about cancer and oncology.
Q: And they'll changing annually. They're --
A: Well, they keep subdividing is the problem, so there's no such thing as breast cancer any more, there's breast cancer, basal B, basal A, Interleukin-2 negative. I mean, they keep subdividing and subdividing and subdividing those
tumors as we get more molecular information.

Q So you don't know how much it cost you to do one treatment of chemotherapy?

A Oh, it would really depend on the drugs. Some drugs are dirt cheap. 588 is one that's from anywhere from a dollar. Interleukin is $5,000 or $6,000.

Q Well, if a patient has ovarian cancer and you were going to treat them with chemotherapy, what would it cost and how many times a week might you give that person some type of chemotherapy?

A Well, currently Platinol Taxol is a typical standard. Those drugs are now in generics, they're not that expensive any more. I don't know of the exact cost. I can take a stab and say one treatment is probably around to $500 to $1,000 and you have that every three or four weeks. So roughly -- I'm going to take a stab and say $1,000 a month or less.

Q Okay. But you didn't examine Dr. Buttar's financial records about these costs, did you?

A No, I didn't.

Q And I assume that you don't have any idea about the relative costs that he's charted other than you saying that the services had no value. Is that your testimony?

A It appears so, yes. Not only does it have no value, you're
taking 40 hours a week of their time.
QWell, how many -- if an ovarian cancer patient had ovarian
cancer or if another person had to have some type of
intravenous treatment, might they sit in your office seven,
eight hours at a time per day?
ANo. The longest treatment I would give -- the absolute longest
is tox scan and that's once a month and that could take
six hours. A typical carboplatin Toxol, you can do in
two and a half to three hours and it's once a month, not
every day.
QI believe you said 33 percent of your current patients are
hematologic cancer patients; is that correct?
AProbably, it's a guess, but probably.
QAnd you were talking about the use of experimental drugs, that
you didn't believe in them. There are some you said that
was being used by different people and I believe you said
today there were a lot of experimental drugs being approved
and some of them are used even if they're not FDA approved;
is that correct?
ANo, I don't think that's correct. I don't think I ever said
that.
QWell, did you say that we know that the FDA is going to approve
it and they'll going on to administer them? Do you
remember that?

A No, I don't remember that, but I cannot get a non-FDA approved drug.

Q Well, I believe you said you send people up to Duke and they're doing experimental, of course that's a controlled environment, but they're doing it even though they may not be FDA approved.

A Those are clinical trials in a process I just described that's under FDA supervision.

Q Okay. Have you had any training or experience with complimentary alternative medicines?

A Only the ones I mentioned shark cartilage and -- (inaudible).

Q Can you define for me what C-A-M or CAM is?

A No, I cannot.

Q So you don't have anybody that's doing the conventional and alternative medicine simultaneously, nor have you read about it or seen it occur? Is that fair?

A That would be fair.

Q Now, the question is, how sick are the people after they have been in your office anywhere from three to six hours?

A Well, some days they really don't get very sick. It's kind of surprising. About 36 months ago they came out with two drugs and since they have come out, the nausea and
vomiting have almost disappeared. I'd say vomiting with chemotherapy is only 10 percent now.

Q Okay. So that's improved some?

A It's improved dramatically. And for instance, the drug Cisplatin, I just quit using it, it was so -- the vomiting was so bad we made them switch from Cisplatin. Well, it came out with new drugs, we've been able to go back to Cisplatin with minimal toxins.

Q Now, you say that the integrative concepts of medical drugs or the alternatives, you can use CAM, didn't provide much beneficial effect and sometimes that's true of chemotherapy, isn't it?

A It is true, but we can tell you we have clinical trials that show there is a proven clinical benefit. We can tell you what the percent response rate is and the percent of non-response rate. And in addition, you get two doses of reassessments not responding and quit, we just don't keep pouring it in.

Q Okay. And then you talked about the alternatives like PCSPES for prostate cancer. You do know about that?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

A I want to believe that name was changed recently.
QThe question was asked you by Ms. Godfrey, do you know what integrative medicine is and your answer was you did not know. Is that correct?

AI think she asked me to define integrative medicine, but, anyway, it's -- no, I don't know exactly.

QAnd you don't really know what the definition is?

ANo, I do not.

QDid you hear me read the statute this morning?

AYeah, I did.

QIs that the first time you had ever seen that or heard it?

AI think unless you read -- I think you read it to me during the deposition.

QAnd not to be redundant, but you've never read about integrative practice?

ANo, that's not true. It's in our journals. I mean, they have articles like I said in the Journal of Oncology book, there's a whole section on alternative therapy and I read that.

QLet me ask you this question, the question was put to you by Mrs. Godfrey. Do you know anything about the standard of care for an integrative medicine doctor and you answered with no. That's correct?

AThat's correct.
Q And you don't profess to offer an opinion about what the standard of care for an integrative doctor is; is that true?
A Yes, it is.
Q There are some Phase I vaccines that's been tried by people as alternatives, correct?
A Phase -- you're speaking of a Phase I trial?
Q Yes.
A That I would not call an alternative under a Phase I trial.
Q Well, vaccines on the Phase I patients or in Phase I of therapy --
Brittany Godfrey: To increase their immune system.
Q -- to increase their immune system?
A I don't think that's alternative medicine at all. I think that is standard medicine. I mean, you're trying to use vaccines to fight cancer for probably 50 years. The most successful to date has been Interleukin-2. I think we went into this in deposition that Interleukin-2 is in fact an FDA approved drug and used in therapy to fight both renal cell and melanoma and some carcinomas. It's not terribly effective, but it does have about a 10 percent response rate.
Q But it's given to help the person's immune system?
A:

Yes, but it's not an alternative therapy. It's standard medical therapy.

Q:

I guess we can argue about that. My -- my question is, they give the vaccine to strengthen the person's immune system so they can help fight the cancer. Is that fair?

A:

No, it's not fair. When you give the immune therapies that have been proven to work in clinical trials because we've shown that they treat the cancer and we document it with CAT scans.

Q:

So it's your testimony that the vaccines that you use attack the cancer and do nothing to the immune system or does it do both?

A:

It does not do both. The immune system Interleukin-2 -- (inaudible) -- and vaccines are an attempt to stimulate the immune system to react -- (inaudible). For instance -- (inaudible) -- spent 30 years on Melanoma vaccine and never could get one that works, but he tried and tried and tried. He's retired now. And they continue to do that and there are trials out there trying to use antigens to stimulate the immune system to get the body's own immune system to fight the cancer. So far other than Interleukin-2 and -- (inaudible) -- Interferon and -- (inaudible) -- and critics out there
even try success -- (inaudible).

Q Interleukin-2 is that given to boost the immune system after chemotherapy?

A No. It's given to bring the white cells back up after chemotherapy and it has no anti-cancer effect and it's never had an anti-cancer effect.

Q I understand that. But if my white cells go to 10,000 or 15,000, my immune system is ineffective. If somebody gives me this particular drug to bring my white count back down, it would probably have to be pretty sick if that were to happen. The idea is to get my total system in better condition, isn't it?

A No, it's not.

Q So if my white cells go to 15,000 -- and I'm not a doctor -- but if they go to 15,000 and I get Interleukin, that's going to attack the cancer?

A No.

Q It's going to help the immune system?

A No. All that a patient does it's called granulate --

(inaudible) -- immune factor. It does one thing and one thing only. It brings up the -- (inaudible). It doesn't do anything to hemoglobin, it doesn't do anything to T-cell -- (inaudible) -- to bring the white cells up which tends
to reduce the incidence of the -- neutra -- (inaudible).

It does not -- (inaudible) --to your immune system.

QWell, let me read what you said. You said, the only two drugs
that have been shown to work in melanoma is -- (inaudible)
-- and Interleukin. Chemotherapy is almost worthless.

Okay.

AWhat was that? I couldn't -- was that about adrenal cell cancer
-- and what was it? I couldn't hear the first part of
what you said.

QI'm sorry. The only two drugs that have been shown to work
in melanoma --

ARight.

Q -- are the Interferon and Interleukin and chemotherapy you
said was almost worthless.

But the next question was, but the mechanism of those
treatments is to boost the immune system of the patient
with melanoma. And you said, that's the idea, yeah.

AYeah. Well, the idea is to -- you're trying to turn this into
an alternative medicine therapy. It isn't to boost the
immune system, it's to trigger the immune system to react
to the cancer cells.

QI'm not trying to turn it any way, I'm just reading you what
you said. Did you say that, yes or no?
MR. JIMISON: Well, objection. At some point I think if he's going to quote Dr. Peterson's deposition perhaps we should all be following along and give Dr. Peterson a copy of his deposition to see exactly what he said.

MR. KNOX: Well --

MS. GODFREY: It's in the -- it's in the book.

MR. JIMISON: I know, but if you could turn to us and guide us to the page you're reading from --

MR. KNOX: It's on page 18, Doctor.

MR. JIMISON: What exhibit?

MR. KNOX: Of his deposition.

MS. GODFREY: Dr. Peterson's deposition is our Exhibit Number -- it's number --

MR. JIMISON: Actually it is 15 in our notebook.

MS. GODFREY: 51.

MR. JIMISON: Actually, let me ask you to go to --15 of in the thin notebook and they can turn to page -- turn to page 18 and there are quarter pages.

WITNESS: And there's all kinds of numbers and books. It's very confusing.

MR. JIMISON: So you want to look at the top right-hand corner.

WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. JIMISON: And then you want to go to page 18.

WITNESS: Is page 6 on the transcript. Okay?

MS. GODFREY: Yes.

WITNESS: All right. Yeah, I'm with you all.

MR. JIMISON: Okay.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) So under line 10, okay. But the mechanism of those treatments is to boost the immune system of the patient with melanoma? And your answer was --

AYeah, that's the idea. But I didn't make the statement, Mr. Knox, you did, I just responded to the question. I wasn't -- (inaudible).

QWell, do you think --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Pardon me. Can you tell me again where you were in the transcript?

MR. KNOX: I'm on page --

MS. GODFREY: 18.

MR. KNOX: -- 18.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And is that in your book or in --

MR. KNOX: It's in the thin book.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: It's in your book or Marcus'?

MS. GODFREY: It's in both. It's --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: In both.

MS. GODFREY: Yeah, 51 in our book.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: And there's page 18.

Q (By Mr. Knox) And then in the very next line, line 21: (sic) So taking the vaccine is intended to do what? And what did you say?

A That's not what I said.

Q Do you see the answer on page 21.

A On page 21.

Q I'm sorry, line 22. I'm going too fast.

MR. JIMISON: Page 21?

A I hope he's taking Megace to stimulate their appetite.

What cancer are we talking about here?

MR. JIMISON: Colon.

AColon cancer vaccine trial.

Q Yes. And you said that was done to boost immune systems.

A Yeah, that was probably a poor choice of words. The more specific would be to prevent colon cancer antigens the immune effective cells hoping that they will trigger the immune system to react to the colon cancer -- (inaudible) -- added on to the vaccine.

Q Now, I believe you said the National Institute of Health has printed that there are thousands of trials out there of things to do to build up their immune system for cancer
patients; is that true?

AI don't think I said thousands. There's thousands of trial, but they're not all for the immune systems. Some are for chemotherapy, some are for antibodies, some are for pharmaco-biologic targeted therapies, some are anti -- (inaudible) -- trying to attach mutations. I don't recall saying there were thousands of --

QWell, go to page 23, line 2. Are you with me?
AYeah, there's thousands of trials out there.

QMay I ask the question, please?
ASure.

QCan you think of any other cancers where there are studies that you aware of that are treating it to boost their patient's immune system. And what did you say?
AIf you look at the web site at the National Institute -- the NIH, there's thousands of trials out there. I'm sure, if I looked, there will be all kinds of immune trials out there, but they're all Phase I and none of them are successful. But I did not say there's thousands of new trials. It says there's thousands of trial out there. Period.

QOkay.
AAnd I want to be clear about that. I did not say that.
Q: But you said people are still trying it and you said sure, correct?

A: Absolutely they're trying it, but -- but I don't get to do that in my office. That gets done in a setting, a controlled trial where they are collecting data and some of the patients get -- where they are looking for toxicity and efficacy and it's monitored and it's in a randomized fashion so we can tell if it's actual fact. That's not the same as me just making up a vaccine in my backyard and giving it to patients because, oh, I think it'll help your immune system.

MR. KNOX: Well, objection, being unresponsive.

MR. JIMISON: I think it was quite responsive.

MR. KNOX: Well, I made an objection to the doctor.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Your objection --

MR. KNOX: My objection that that was not a responsive answer, but a voluntary speech.

MR. JIMISON: It's his question. The witness is more than -- more than entitled to explain his answer on cross-examination. There -- I mean, he's entitled to explain his answer.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You can ask then, perhaps when you cross-examine, you should give him an opportunity to
Q (By Mr. Knox) Then on page -- page 21 again at the top you look at it starting at line 10 and you said that they're trying to use the immune system all the time. I just -- somebody I sent to Duke for a vaccine for colon cancer, but as a trial, correct?

A That is correct.

Q That's -- the idea is to treat the immune system.

A No, again, you keep trying to say that. I don't know how many times I have to go over this. No, it does not say treat the immune system. That sentence does not say treat the immune system. It says use of the vaccine to treat the cancer and the vaccine is not to change or boost the immune system. It's to trigger an immunologic response to specific colon cancer patient.

Q You may be right, but go to line 22. See that? So taking the vaccine is intended to do what? And you said -- read it.

A We hope it will boost the immune system to fight the cancer, but it wasn't -- that answer was not given in context that you're asking me now. It is -- you're trying to imply that these vaccines sometimes --
Q: I want --

A: sometimes make your immune -- you asked a question, I'm going to answer it.

MR. KNOX: Well, I object to your speaking. Answer the question.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Just answer the question.

A: The answer is the vaccines are not to boost the immune system. The immune system is already very functional. The idea is to see if you can trigger an immunological response to specific cancer antigens. It is not the same thing as saying boost the immune system.

Q: Does chemotherapy decrease the immune system?

A: The majority of it does, yes. Some of the biologic there just do not, but some of the -- (inaudible) -- antibodies do not.

Q: And there are times when you give people certain minerals and vitamins to help them with -- to build back up their immune system?

A: No.

Q: You don't do that at all?

A: No.

Q: Okay. You don't give anybody vitamin C even if it shows that their vitamin C is low when you treat a cancer patient?
I've never seen a low vitamin C level, and if I did, I'm sure I'd give it to them. But, again, it wouldn't be to boost their immune system, it would be to treat vitamin C deficiency which is not the same as an immune depression.

Let's move forward. You said when asked about Dr. Buttar's treatments that they were below the standard of care. Yet, you told Mrs. Godfrey you didn't know what an IRR was, did you?

I'd never heard that acronym.

And you didn't know whether he had actually seen any one of these cancer patients and had injected them with IRR or another procedure?

I didn't understand that question.

You didn't know that he had seen or had done a procedure on all three of these cancer patients?

No, I didn't see it in the records, so I didn't know about that. I did not know.

You have used an ET -- EDTA as a chelated agent for chronic lead toxicity, haven't you?

Yes, I have.

And you still do that, correct?

Yes. And that's standard medical therapy.

And that's used in conventional medicine?
AThat's correct, yes. But, of course, for a specific diagnosis.

QYou did not know what EMPS was, did you?

ANo.

QBut yet you said it was below the standard of care to use it, didn't you?

AThat's correct.

QNever heard of it before, right?

AThat's correct.

QOne of the things you read out there when the lawyer asked you the question about the other procedures and drugs used, GHS -- GSH, an antioxidant, you didn't know what that was either, did you?

AYou know, I know from the deposition, I believe it's glutathione something along -- I can't remember but that is back with my biochemistry days. If I remember right --

QBut you had -- I'm sorry, are you through?

AI didn't recognize the acronym, but it's glutathione.

QBut you had no problem to say it's below the standard of care because the doctor used it, am I right?

AThat's absolutely right because it -- it is not a therapy for any cancer. I don't have to -- there's lots of -- there's tons of chemicals out there. I don't pretend to know all of them. There's probably, who knows, millions of
chemicals. I don't pretend to know what they all are, but I know the ones that are related to cancer and GSH is not one of them.

Q: But you have heard of it being used as an antioxidant?
A: No.

Q: Well, go down and look at page 42, line 6. Have you ever heard it as being an antioxidant? And you said, yeah, actually I've heard that, yeah. Is that correct?
A: I don't see it.

MS. GODFREY: Page 42.

A: I guess I also heard it at one time, but I don't remember it now.

Q: Did you say that?
A: I'm sure I did say that.

Q: And then over, do you believe that proper nutrition would help a person in the fight of cancer; is that correct?
A: Yes.

Q: And there's -- I believe you said, it's a whole section in the Journal of Clinical Oncology that talks about giving people supportive care to keep their nutrition up.

A: Is that a statement or a question?
Q: I'm asking you.
A: What was the question?
Q You had indicated that there were whole articles in the Journal of Medical Oncology called supportive therapy -- supportive care. Do you find that supportive care is essential to cancer patients?
A I think it's important, yes.
Q And do you give any type of minerals to anybody that -- that may be deficient that you've treated with chemotherapy?
A What do you mean by a mineral?
A Well, any type of minerals that you might think might build up your -- the -- the body of the system of the individual that's very sick from both the cancer and the chemotherapy?
A No.
Q Okay. You then say you believed in biofeedback; is that correct?
A I don't recall saying I believed in it. I said I was aware of it.
Q Well, do you use biofeedback with your patients?
A No.
Q Not at all?
A No.
Q You never sat down and talked to them about the stress level?
A Sure, I do, but I don't call that biofeedback. I call that the practice of medicine.
Q: The practice of medicine?
A: Yes.

Q: As a matter of fact, you keep a couple of dogs in there to help people deal with stress, am I correct?
A: I do, but I don't bill for the dogs.

Q: Well, I understand, that's good and I appreciate that. The point is you're giving intravenous injections in your office, correct?
A: What has that got to do with the dogs again?

Q: Well, may I just finish. You're giving intravenous injections in your office you say because it takes a long time and people get stressed out and the dogs help reduce their stress; is that true?
A: Oh, I think they probably enjoy the dogs. Does it reduce their stress? It might.

Q: Let's go through where you -- you filled out your form, if I can find it. You filled out the form on your patients and so if you will turn to those.

MS. GODFREY: They're -- they're number 8 in our book.
MR. KNOX: And briefly, do you have --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Tab 8.

MS. GODFREY: Tab 8 in our book.

Q (By Mr. Knox) Okay. Just look at your expert sheet and just
on Exhibit --

MR. KNOX: What's that exhibit?

MS. GODFREY: It's our Exhibit 8.

Q-- our Exhibit 8. You reviewed Patient A, B and C, all cancer patients, right?

ARight.

QPatient D who had -- depending on what you say, either polyps or constipation or whatever that you diagnosed, correct?

AI didn't diagnose anything. I just reported what I saw in the chart.

QAnd you wrote in this letter, of course, this was two hours of time. Thank you, John Peterson, M.D.

AActually my office manager wrote that, but that's right.

That's right.

QAnd you sent that to the North Carolina Medical Board?

ARight.

QNow, Dr. Peterson, if I could, what did you understand your role to be when this was sent down there?

AWell, they just asked me to look at some charts and see if I thought the standard of care was met, so I reviewed them and gave them my opinion.

QAnd you had no idea that you would ever be called to testify at a Medical Board hearing to take somebody's privileges
to practice medicine, did you?

ANo, I didn't at that time.

QAnd had you known that, would you have spent more time?

AProbably not. It wasn't that hard. I mean, most of these charts are just labs, there's very little progress notes.

There's almost nothing in the way of x-ray studies to look at.

QAre you telling this panel that you went through 10,000 -- 1,000 pages in two hours?

AAAs I just said, the vast majority were just acts of labs reports.

It wasn't thousands of pages of medical records. In terms of patient care records, there's -- I don't know how many there were, but there were less than 100.

QAnd -- and you wrote down on Patient C -- Patient A that -- did I get it right -- that the diagnosis was in the standard of practice, correct?

AIt's probably -- mine aren't labeled A, B and C, so you're going to have to read them again.

MS. GODFREY: She's the one who begins with a W.

ACervical cancer?

MS. GODFREY: Yes.

QCorrect.

AYeah.
QAnd you wrote down the maintenance of the records were within the standard, correct?
AThat's right.
QAnd -- and down at the bottom you put, no physician contact documented; is that correct?
AThat's was my -- I could not see it, that's correct.
QAnd do you know that Dr. Buttar actually did an examination on the patient?
AWell, he may have, but I don't have him. I have the records and the records didn't reflect it.
QOkay.
AIt doesn't mean it didn't happen. I'm just saying it wasn't in the records.
QNOr did you learn that he had done the three IRR procedures on the patient?
AAgain, I only had the records. If it's not documented in the records, it's not possible for me to know that.
QDo you know if these records were written in a different handwriting from the nurse assistant?
AI can't remember, I'd have to look at the records.
QAll right. Let's go to the next one. Patient -- Patient B.
MS. GODFREY: 51-year-old with ovarian cancer.
QAll right. You got that?
AYeah, I've got that.

Q And you indicated that he made a diagnosis within the standard of care, correct?

AYeah.

Q But you found that his records were below the standard of care, correct?

AThat's what I marked, yeah.

Q And do you know -- are you able to say whether or not Dr. Buttar actually did a physical exam and wrote the information in the chart?

ATIt was -- my recollection on the records, I couldn't see that he did.

Q Okay. And -- and there again you said there had been no physician contact with the patient --

ANot that --

Q -- documented. I'm sorry.

ARight, documented. You know, all I can say is what I saw in the records. I didn't see it in the records.

Q Well, would it affect your opinion in any way to know that he spent time with this patient on more than one occasion and he did an exam, that he did the three IRR --

MR. JIMISON: Objection, it's assuming facts not in evidence.
AYeah, I have no idea if any of those things happened.

QWell, if it -- if he had seen her that many times, would that affect your decision?

AWell, it would depend on what he did. I mean, there's no documentation. I mean, he could have had a phone conversation in the hallway and called that a physician visit.

QSo you don't know whether he did touch the patient, talk to the patient or called from the hallway, is that what --

AWhat I know is what was in the record. And I didn't see any history and physical performed by Dr. Buttar in the record.

QWell, the way you describe this, the standard of care in each one of these cases is just to refer the patient down to hospice without any care, give them some pain medicine; isn't that correct?

AWell, I think you're -- it's not exactly what I said. What I said was at this point, this patient has two choices. One is that of hospice for care.

Two is going for experimental therapies, Phase I trials, if she so chose and could do so. Most of the patients opt not to at this point because the efficacy of Phase I trials is so poor and when you're this far down and you're this sick, it usually doesn't do any good. Most patients
They can't do Phase I trials without a protocol, can they?

Well, if they can go -- we've got universities and in Charlotte, they've got very sophisticated oncology care down there. There's clinical trials in the private practices in Charlotte.

But they don't fit into the precise setting that were mentioned to be treated, do they?

I don't know, it depends on trials that are open.

Well, there are some trials -- you indicated that there was a couple of patients. You had one from Chapel Hill and one from Duke that went through their protocols and they were sent out and terminated the treatment and they came down to you and you elected to treat them further, didn't you?

That's correct because they were still responsive to standard chemotherapy.

MS. GODFREY: Did he try to treat them with experimental --

Did you treat them with experimental drugs or --

No, I treated them with standard chemotherapy.

So I guess my question is, if Patient A had been to Indiana or something and said no further, your acknowledged standard of care would have been, said, go home, take some...
pain medication and talk about it with hospice; is that correct?

A That's what I would have advised him to do, yes.

Q And so it's your decision that -- your opinion that if a patient wants to -- elected -- elect and have freedom of choice to go to a doctor of their choice to seek further treatment, that's below the standard of care for a doctor to treat them; is that correct?

A It is below the standard of care to do ineffective therapy. These are emotionally, desperate, scared patients and taking advantage of them under the libertarian argument that it's a free country and aiding them into this is bogus. We're not talking about the patient's side, we're talking about the doctors side.

Q Well, didn't you say that if a patient wanted to go for further treatment, it was up to them and their freedom of choice?

A It's up to the patient, that's right, but not my freedom of choice as a physician if I would start giving bogus treatments. I don't have the right to do that. The patients can do whatever they chose. I cannot do whatever I chose.

Q Well, who do you think brought these patients down to see Dr. Buttar other than themselves?
AI understand what the patient did. It's not what the patient did. We're talking about what the doctor did.

And once again, I am not free to do whatever I want in my office. I'm a regulated entity of the State of North Carolina and I cannot give ineffective therapy just because the patient wants it. Your argument would be you go to thoracics --

Q I'm not interested in my argument.

A You asked the question, I think I can answer this.

MR. JIMISON: Just a moment.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Oh, you can answer.

MR. KNOX: I mean, I'm sorry if he's offended, but --

A But you're not listening to me. I got to tell you, this is going to drive me nuts. There we go, it's working.

(Referencing microphone)

You cannot walk in a thoracic surgeon's office and demand open heart surgery just because you want it. That surgeon cannot perform surgery unless it's effective. And he cannot go to coronary and get a completely unnecessary procedure because the patient wanted it.

Q If I walk in after I've been through analysis, I have major heart problems, I'm going to die in 30 days, you mean to tell me I can't go to a medical doctor and say, Doctor,
is there something you can give me that will help --

Absolutely. But what I'm trying to point out and if I can

is what he gave him didn't help them and there's no evidence

that it will. If he had something to help them with, that's

fine.

Q And you don't know what it is, do you?

A I know it doesn't work. And there's -- and here's how we know.

It's not my job to prove it doesn't work, it's his job

to prove that it does. First, you have to prove it's

effective before you can give it.

Q I think it's the Board's job to prove it.

A No, it's not the Board's job. It's the FDA's job to prove

it.

Q Let's go to the next one. These people that you've treated

from Duke and Carolina have been through their protocol,

right? And they -- they failed for some reason or their

protocol didn't match?

A I'm not -- what are you talking about?

Q I thought you said you had saved somebody that was sent away

from one of the hospitals that didn't meet their protocol.

A No, that's not what I said. What I had was -- I've had patients

that were -- this is most interesting.

This was a patient with metastatic ovarian cancer who had
been treated by the oncology service at UNC. And Dr. Van
Lee called me and said, you know, we've tried three
different regimens, she's progressed to -- (inaudible)
and we want to send her to you, we don't think there's
much else we can do.
And when I got all the records and proceeded to look through
it, it was quite clear to me that she actually had very
obviously chemo responsive disease. Part of the reason
being she was a GYN oncologist and she's not a medical
oncologist.
And all I did was go back to the first treatment she used
carbo/Taxol which is really quite responsive and she lived
another seven and a half years and worked full-time for
seven out of those seven and a half years.
QSo your treatment saved her life at least some period of time?
AIt prolonged it, but I gave, once again, standard chemotherapy
that was with FDA approved drugs.
QAnd that was after they told her that it was over and it was
over for her, didn't they?
AWell, they were a research institution and they really aren't
interested in treating chronically ill patients for years
and years. Once they've done what they can do, it's not
unusual for them to refer them out to a private practitioner
for ongoing care. They're really not in the business to
do what I do.

QOkay. Let's go to the last patient, Patient D. And I think
we can move through this. Patient D. I believe you
indicated that the doctor had treated this patient with
chelation therapy for constipation; is that what -- that's
what you wrote on your sheet, isn't it?

AYeah, and I got that from the -- from the -- from the record.

That was what I understood from the records that were
given to me.

QOkay. It says, 46-year-old female with constipation and

   essentially --

AColonoscopy.

Q-- other than polyp was treated by Dr. Buttar for EDTA chelation
   for heavy metals and constipation.

ARight.

QYou ever heard of that in your life?

ANo.

QAnd you know now that that's incorrect?

AWell, I'm not sure. I couldn't tell from the record what they
   were doing.

QHave you read Patient D's deposition where she acknowledged
   when she came to the doctor, she --
MR. JIMISON: Objection, just ask him if he read Patient D's deposition.

AI have not read Patient D's deposition.

QWell, if the testimony is that she had a prior lead drug analysis and she came to Dr. Buttar asking for treatment of the lead problem, that certainly wouldn't be consistent with treatment for constipation, would it?

ANo, it wouldn't.

QOkay. So do you think you were a little quick on that opinion?

ANo. I -- all I had was the records. I -- I can't do anything except what the records reflect and if that was in there, I could not find it and I didn't see any serum lead levels. If you're doing EDTA chelation, you do serum lead levels to make sure it's working. I didn't see that.

QAnd you didn't see the test that she brought, did you?

ANo.

QOkay.

AI'm assuming it wasn't in the records I was given.

QAnd you believe it was below the standard of practice because the diagnosis was improper, didn't you?

ACorrect.

QOkay. But you said that the maintenance of the records were in the standard of care.
A: For the records I saw, I thought they were, yeah.

Q: And then you said that the doctor should have not treated her with chelation therapy; is that correct?

A: That's correct.

Q: Now, Doctor, as I understand it, you basically believe that the standard of care for treating any cancer are the three modalities that you use and unless that is used any other experimental drugs has to be in a controlled environment like at Duke or Chapel Hill or someplace like that; is that correct?

A: It doesn't have to be Duke or UNC. It has to be in a controlled clinical trial. Now, I don't do them in my office because my office is too small, but there's lots of private practices that have clinical trials. Certainly in Charlotte there's one.

Q: There's a Dr. White in Charlotte that does that?

A: I'm not sure which -- Richard White?

Q: I believe you said there was a Dr. White that --

A: Oh, well, I'm -- yeah, there's a Richard White in Charlotte.

Q: Have you read that the doctors at CM Hospital at Charlotte, I keep forgetting the name -- Carolina Memorial Hospital --

A: Yes.

Q: -- is now treating people with microwaves for tumors?
A: Oh, sure. We've been doing it at UNC and Duke, yeah, but those are only trials.

Q: Been doing it how long?

A: I don't know, sir. I don't do it, but I know that they do it --

Q: How about --

A: -- radio frequency ____.

Q: I'm sorry. How about with radio waves? Are you familiar with any of those procedures?

A: What do you mean radio? You mean, opposed to radiation?

Q: Yes, radio waves.

A: No, I'm not.

Q: Have you read anything about that the Harvard people says it's the most innovative thing to --

A: Once again, that's not approved therapy and it's going on under a trial. It's not --

Q: Well, I'm asking what you know.

A: What I've read in the newspaper, that's all I know. It's not -- it's not an FDA approved treatment. It may be some day.

Q: Yeah. Do you agree that CA 125 is -- is a measure of cancer cell growth?

A: It's a very -- it can be, but it can also grow with endometriosis. We use it when somebody has been diagnosed
with ovarian cancer and it might respond to treatment.

Q What's your understanding that -- what's the highest level
   of CA 125 that you've seen?

A Oh, I'm going to say over 10,000.

Q And what's the -- what's the formula for what it's supposed
   to be?

A It's supposed to be under 20, depending on the lab they use,
   but supposed to be under 30.

Q Okay. And -- and I take it from that that you looked at Patient
   D and saw that her labs went from 10,000 down to about
   6200? Do you remember reading that?

A No, I don't remember reading it.

Q So you never saw that?

A Well, I looked at these six, seven months ago. I don't remember
   it.

Q I understand. But if that were to occur, would that be an
   improvement?

A Not necessarily. The tumor mercury can fluctuate and you can
   see tumor mercurys go down and CAT scans get worse is why
   we don't rely entirely on tumor markers. We monitor them
   so we put them through so many CT scans. We always follow
   them up with CAT scan to be certain that the tumor marker
   reflects what's actually going on.
QFinally, you have said that in your review of the records, you can see no place that Dr. Buttar had done harm to his patients.

AWell, not -- yeah, he's done harm. He's scheduled them in his office 40 hours a week and took thousands of dollars from dying patients for no good reason.

QWell, and today you said that the treatment did not provide a risk --

AI don't -- I don't -- well, first of all, I don't know what provides risks because these things haven't been put through clinical trials. I don't think it looks dangerous.

QHang on just one minute. Let's go if you would please, sir, to 77 -- no, I'm sorry, 119. Okay?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Where is it on 119?

MS. GODFREY: In his deposition. Tab 51 to our --

WITNESS: Well, where's the deposition one?

MR. JIMISON: 15 in the thin notebook.

MR. KNOX: I got it.

AWhich page?

Q(By Mr. Knox) 119, line 21.

AOkay.

QWhat about physically? Do you see any evidence that they were
physically harmed by Dr. Buttar's treatment and what did you say?

AI said: No, but, you know, I wasn't there to examine them or talk to them. And the people doing the documentation were the people giving the bogus treatments, so I doubt they are going to write things down that are going to make them look bad.

QLet's go down to the next line. So there's nothing in your review that shows any visible harm whether they occurred or not, you don't know?

AThat's right.

QAnd I believe you said today at your earlier testimony that you didn't find any risks of the alternative treatment that he was giving these patients?

ANot that I'm aware of.

MR. KNOX: Okay. That's all.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Before we do -- before we redirect, let's take a break.

MR. JIMISON: Oh, sure.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I think everybody would like to take say a ten-minute break and we'll convene back and 4:10 and then we can continue.

MR. KNOX: We might can see if he doesn't have any
questions --

MR. JIMISON: No. I have questions.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Let's just take a break.

(4:00 P.M. - 4:20 P.M. RECESS)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Are you -- thank you very much on that.

Mr. Jimison, are you ready to go ahead and resume with redirect at this time?

MR. JIMISON: Sure.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

QDr. Peterson, I want to try to go through this very quickly.

I know we've gone very long.

AExactly.

QAnd the therapies that Dr. Buttar provided, the hydrogen peroxide, the ozone, are any of those therapies indicated to boost their immune system?

ANo.

QAre you aware of any clinical trials that show they have an effect on boosting the immune system?

ANo.

MR. KNOX: Objection, asked and answered earlier.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: The objection is sustained.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Well, I just -- if it actually was truly asked -- you know, answered earlier about how clinical trials have an effect of boosting the immune system, I think I might have asked about cancer. But the answer is you're not aware of any --

A No.

Q That was your previous answer.

And the -- the therapies that were being offered, did you see from your review of the records whether the patients indicated that they were consenting to any research?

A No.

Q Any -- that they were consenting to experimental therapies?

A No.

MR. KNOX: Objection, been --

MR. JIMISON: No, this was a different witness.

MR. KNOX: May I just make an objection. Give me a chance to say something. He asked all the questions about experimental and -- and whether the patients were placed in experimental on direct.

MR. JIMISON: I think these are different questions and -- and I think the objections are actually more long than the questions are, so if I could just keep going.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead. I think as I recall without looking at the transcript, it was about cancer and not about the immune system.

MR. KNOX: Okay. I'm sorry.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) The -- the -- is there anything in the records that show that these patients were part of -- of an experiment or research that were being supplied by an Institutional Review Board?

A No.

Q Is cancer just a symptom of a faulty immune system?

A No.

Q If you were to hear the phrase "cancer is just a symptom", what would you take that to mean?

A Nonsense.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. I have no other questions.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Ms. Godfrey and Mr. Knox, do you want to redirect?

MR. KNOX: No, ma'am. We're through.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Any Board Members have any questions?

EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

DR. McCULLOCH: Now at this point, Dr. Peterson, would you -- would you agree that in each of these patients,
traditional therapy, as you would describe chemotherapy, etcetera, had failed these patients?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: Is it your opinion that there was any physical harm done to these patients by this other treatment at this point?

WITNESS: Other than 40 hours sitting in a chair, no.

DR. McCULLOCH: Right.

WITNESS: No.

DR. McCULLOCH: But I guess the point I'm trying to get to, would there have been any -- would they have been improved at all by staying in traditional therapy?

WITNESS: No.

DR. McCULLOCH: Okay. Thank you.

DR. WALKER: Are you aware of any toxicities from EDTA or from hydrogen peroxide that maybe you read in the newspaper or from any other sources?

WITNESS: Not hydrogen peroxide. The only problem with EDTA and I don't know how far you want me to push it, but it does, in fact, pull lead and heavy metals out of your system similar to -- (inaudible).

I mean for instance, we now prescribe -- (inaudible) -- to prevent prostate cancer and put prostate cancer patients
on, so I really don't know what you are saying when you just start pulling out the metals. I mean, you are supposed to have heavy metals. I mean, you're supposed to have copper and lead in your system. I mean, you're not supposed to deplete them. I mean, iron deficient -- iron is a heavy metal and iron deficiency -- (inaudible), so I don't know that it's necessarily safe to deplete it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Any other questions? Thank you very much, Dr. Peterson.

MR. KNOX: Unless you ask one, I won't.

WITNESS: Okay.

MR. JIMISON: Thank you.

WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. JIMISON: That concludes the Board's case, Dr. Rhyne.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you, Mr. Jimison.

Mr. Knox or Ms. Godfrey, do you have any evidence that you wish to present on behalf of Dr. Buttar?

MS. GODFREY: We do. We need to ask the Board about your timetables. We were originally told that Mr. Jimison would be finished by about 2:00 of the afternoon of the first day and we've run over about two and a half hours.
We have doctors that are supposed to be here first thing tomorrow morning to testify as expert witnesses and then we have one doctor who is testifying via videotape as an expert witness. Her videotaped deposition is an hour and 24 minutes. What we would like to do is get her in today, but we realize that would take the Board about until 6:00.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: That -- that'll be fine.

MS. GODFREY: Is that okay with you?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: That is okay.

MS. GODFREY: That would be -- now is the best time for us to sit and watch a video, I think.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Just -- just for my information, so we'll have her and then how many witnesses do you anticipate tomorrow?

MS. GODFREY: We have --

MR. KNOX: Let me ask you, what time are you going to start in the morning? We have one by phone at 8:30.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, it depends on what you tell me because we can start at 7:30 or earlier. It depends --

MR. KNOX: Well --

MS. GODFREY: We make -- we're doctors, we make rounds at 7:00 or 6:30, so.

MR. KNOX: We have Dr. Wilson and Dr. Biddle and then of
course we'll have Dr. Buttar and Jane Garcia. We have -- on video we have Dixon Hewitt. We hope to have a telephone conference and -- and we have another party. And one of the people is Michelle Reid who worked with Dr. Buttar and Ms. Kennedy testified about.

MS. GODFREY: We have some videos of patient -- patients of Dr. Buttar's that I think altogether take about a couple of hours, but we can work them in tomorrow.

MR. KNOX: We will have a full day.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So we'll have a full day -- well, I will -- we will be happy to start at what time you would like, 7:30, 7:00, whatever.

MS. GODFREY: Whatever time you want to start.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: How long do you think it will take you to get through your --

MR. KNOX: I don't know, but I would, like you, want to get back and so the earlier the better for me because I go about 6:30 every morning, they think I'm a doctor, so.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: That's fine. How about -- does anybody have any conflict. Barbie, do you have any problems starting say at 7:00? We'll start at 7:00 sharp.

COURT REPORTER: I'm at your pleasure.

MR. KNOX: Maybe 7:30. I mean, I'll do whatever you say,
but --

MS. GODFREY:  7:00 a.m.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Let's start at 7:00.

MS. GODFREY: We can play videos.

MR. KNOX: That's fine. We'll put videos on if we don't have the doctors.

DR. WALKER: Oh, but you can't put the videos on and go to sleep now.

MS. GODFREY: No. Actually -- actually, our docs will be here because I believe they're coming in tonight and they'll spending the night, so they would be more than happy to get -- get in and out, I'll bet.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. So we'll start at 7:00 then.

MR. KNOX: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. You want to proceed then?

MR. KNOX: Your Honor, we're calling Dr. Ripoll by video conferencing. This is his deposition and we have agreed that she can be sworn by the court reporter in Charlotte and the transcript would be used at this hearing. Correct?

MS. GODFREY: And her CV is in our exhibits at -- at 31, I believe. And I think the only other exhibit that we used in her video deposition was Dr. Peterson's notes that I think they're already familiar with and I think that's
Exhibit 8.

Didn't we use that? Oh, you weren't there, okay.

I think those are the two, but I do identify them by number during the video deposition, so if you'll just grab our book, then --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: -- that's the easiest way.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Do you need help with -- are you ready?

MS. GODFREY: We're ready, I guess.

The transcript of this deposition is also in your exhibit book at Number 48.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry, number 40?


PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, THE VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF EMILIA RIPOLL, M.D. TAKEN ON APRIL 21, 2008, WAS PLAYED AND IS HEREBY ATTACHED IN ITS ENTIRETY AS EXHIBIT 48)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Can somebody turn on the lights? Okay.

Do you have anything more to add? Are you ready to --
MR. KNOX: I have a gentleman here who can testify and it might take ten minutes or so.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. KNOX: Let's go get Mr. Hewitt.

WHEREUPON,

RICHARD DIXON HEWITT,

being first duly sworn,

was examined and testified

as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

Q Would you tell the Panel your name please, sir?
A Richard Dixon Hewitt.

Q And, Mr. Hewitt, where do you live?
A Anderson, South Carolina.

Q And who lives with you?
A My wife, Deana, three children, a boy, boy, girl; 12, 10 and 5.

Q Okay. And what do you do?
A I'm a human resources director for Clareton Mills, a towel manufacturer in Delta in South Carolina.

Q And how long have you been with them?
About 17 years.

And is your wife employed outside the home?
She is. She is a physical therapist.

Now, you've had the occasion to take one of your children up to see Dr. Buttar, correct?
That's correct.

And what's that child's name?
Hunter.

And how old is Hunter?
He will be 13 next month.

And tell the Board just a little bit about Hunter and how he did prior to going to see Dr. Buttar.
At the age of two and a half, three, Hunter was diagnosed and given a label of autism. And we bounced around from physician to physician, doctor to doctor, and he -- like I say, he's about 13, next month, and he's -- he's come along way. He -- you know, he was taken out of preschool because he was not verbal and -- and -- and would strike out and would possibly create a danger to himself and others, so you know now he's, at times, in a regular education classroom, so.

Yeah. Was he diagnosed by a family doctor -- a family practice
doctor that he was autistic?
A He was. He was diagnosed by our family pediatrician, Dr. Keith Hart.
Q And did he have certain lead toxicity tests before he went to see Dr. Buttar?
A No, sir.
Q And went you went up to see Dr. Buttar, did you see Dr. Buttar?
A I saw -- my wife and I, our original appointment was with Dr. Buttar.
Q Okay. And tell this Panel what kind of doctor he was and how much time he spent with you?
A Dr. Buttar in the first visit spent, I'm guessing, an hour to an hour and a half that first visit.
Q Okay. And did he explain to you whether or not he could cure autism or whether he could help Hunter or what did he tell you?
A Dr. Buttar felt like there was -- there was a possibility -- a very strong possibility Hunter -- Hunter had a toxicity issue and if that was the issue, that there was some help for him. And he outlined his treatment plan, what that would consist of. There was not any guarantee made. He did feel as though that if the toxicity wasn't even an issue, he felt very strongly we could help him. And
so it made sense to -- all of our research and -- and it made sense for us to try that treatment and therapy.

Q And I'm trying to move along. Will you explain the policy of payments, whether insurance may or may not apply and the method of payment for the treatments?

A We just paid for it. There was no guarantee of insurance assistance and we just, you know, put it on a credit card and hoped it would work out in the end, you know, with the -- you know, we paid on a cash basis.

And we knew -- again, I knew what I was getting into before I even walked in the door. I had called and -- and spoken with his staff on, okay, well, if we did this, what is it going to cost? If we did this, what's it going to cost?

And so, I mean, I knew that going in.

Q Are you satisfied now that Dr. Buttar's treatment of Hunter has been beneficial --

MR. JIMISON: Objection, leading. It's leading.

MR. KNOX: I know. It's 6:30, I'm sorry.

Q All right. Tell me -- go ahead and tell us -- explain to the Panel what your observation is.

A My current observation is -- is Hunter has got a long way to go, but he's -- he's come so very far. It's -- his -- his -- his toxicity was an issue. It was his amounts were
grotesque. It was just -- it was toxic.

And so, you know, we cleaned him up, began the hyperbaric oxygen therapy and -- and he can do things. He has a quality of life now that before, there's no question he wouldn't have had. You know, when you get -- when you receive a phone call from your physician, physical education teachers that hasn't seen him over the course of the summer and he tells you what's --

MR. JIMISON: Objection --

A-- what's going on --

MR. JIMISON: -- that's hearsay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I couldn't --

MR. JIMISON: That's what -- what the teacher said.

AI received --

MR. JIMISON: Objection as to what the teacher may have said.

AI received a phone call from the teacher.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead and proceed.

AAnd the teacher asks what's going on with Hunter. I mean, he's -- he's -- his fine motor skills, gross motor skill is remarkably different and better, what's -- I mean, what's going on. That tells you all you need to know as far as how far he's come and whether he's benefited from
the treatments.

And my observation is I'm an ecstatic parent because the quality of life my son -- I see for my son versus what he had is not parallel.

QOkay. How many drugs was he on at the time he came to Dr. Buttar?

AFive -- at the time he walked in the door, he was on five medications. It might -- at one point in time it was seven and started out at one, but when he walked in the door he was on five medications.

QAnd how about now?

AHe's not. He's -- he's on vitamins and minerals and -- that's -- that's what he's on.

MR. KNOX: All right.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. Mr. Jimison, do you want to cross-examine.

MR. JIMISON: No.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Any Board Members?

EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

DR. McCULLOCH: You said your son was toxic and I'm happy for your -- for his improvement.

WITNESS: I mean, there's things you're going to hear about.
DR. McCULLOCH: You said he had toxic levels of something.

WITNESS: Yes, sir. Mercury, lead, zinc.

DR. McCULLOCH: And -- and those toxic levels were based on what?

WITNESS: We did labs --

DR. McCULLOCH: I guess my -- my question is, your description of him being toxic is based on which -- what was --

WITNESS: What my understanding of -- of a high -- abnormally high level was.

DR. McCULLOCH: And where did you get that understanding?

WITNESS: From my research, from the laboratory results --

DR. McCULLOCH: And from Dr. Buttar's office?

WITNESS: Yes, sir. There were three parts. The lab gave you results, Dr. Buttar gave you results and I came up with what I thought were my own results.

DR. McCULLOCH: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Were these blood, urine, hair samples or what, and from the same lab.

WITNESS: Fecal, blood, urine. It was a lot of them.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Were the labs done in Dr. Buttar's office?

WITNESS: No. No, independent labs.
DR. WALKER: Did you have any of your other children tested?

WITNESS: No, sir. None of them displayed symptoms or were characteristic of -- you know, gave us any reason for concern. We did hesitate as far as vaccination with our five year old knowing what we, you know, knew, but we still went through with it, so. But we haven't had any of them tested, no, sir.

DR. WALKER: Do you have any ideas from your research why one child might have had toxic levels for what is presumably environmental contamination and nobody else did?

WITNESS: Yes, sir, I do and that's kind of what Dr. Buttar -- some information that he gave me was that, you know, perhaps Hunter has some type of genetic problem to where he just can't rid himself of -- of the metals. And if this was the case, then it's building up in his system to mimic the characteristics, you know, described in autism.

DR. WALKER: You know, most insurance companies will pay for treatment of metal toxicity. Did you ever try to get reimbursement from the insurance company?

WITNESS: Oh, yes, sir, we did. And we did receive some, but it was -- I would be willing to bet 95 percent of it
was turned down.

DR. WALKER: Has your son -- I assume that at the beginning of this ordeal that you've been through that he went through the usual developmental testing that the psychologists do on kids who are having learning problems or other problems. Would that be true? I didn't mean to upset you. I realize that --

WITNESS: If you only knew, but, yes, sir, he --

DR. WALKER: Has he -- since he's improved to such a degree, have you had him retested to sort of see where -- where he's at right now?

WITNESS: Yes, sir. We -- we stay in touch and frequent a developmental pediatrician in Greenville, South Carolina and so, yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: Is it -- so he's -- he's come around in all those -- not only is he looking better to you, but he's looking better on the tests?

WITNESS: What tests are you referring to?

DR. WALKER: The -- the developmental tests, you know, where they -- they do the little studies. I don't know exactly what they might have done.

WITNESS: Yes, sir. I didn't know if you meant the specific lab tests or what have you.
He is -- he's got issues every day, but I'm of the opinion the mercury -- the levels did significant brain damage. I mean, they're a nerve toxin, so he's got issues that we have not -- he has not been able to overcome, but a lot of them he has been.

DR. WALKER: Thank you.

WITNESS: Sure.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Did you call your public health in your area with these toxins, family public health to make sure it was not a problem in the area? Was that done?

WITNESS: I did not make a phone call to any public health official. I sought information from public health officials, but I didn't call asking that type of -- or nothing, I mean.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And you said that he got hyperbaric oxygen and what else did he get? Did he get any other treatment?

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, he did. We received two summers worth. We spent a summer in a hotel in Dustin, Florida, two summers back to back, '05 and '06 and -- in which he received the hyperbaric oxygen treatments administered by Dr. Eddie Zandt in Dustin, Florida. As well as we also tried and explored umbilical cord blood stem cell in
Mexico. That proved to -- you know, there was no benefit to the stem cell, but the hyperbaric oxygen was just miraculous, just off the charts.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt.

MR. KNOX: May I -- excuse me, Your Honor.

FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

Q Did that include some chelation?

A He did. The chelation was the first process. We couldn't get to the hyperbaric oxygen until we basically got him cleaned up.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So he had chelation before he did hyperbaric?

WITNESS: That is correct.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

Q Is his speech better?

A It's -- yes, sir, it's -- and, yes, sometimes too much.

MR. KNOX: That's all I have.

FURTHER EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

DR. WALKER: Could I ask one more question?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. WALKER: What are you doing now to keep him from re-accumulating more toxic metals?

WITNESS: That's a great question. He's on a maintenance
program as Dr. Buttar, you know, his staff have -- you
know, have him in place and he will use the drops, you
know, topically and just monitor him, so it's just
basically a maintenance program.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So excuse me, he's done chelation, drops
and hyperbaric oxygen?

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, and stem cell.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And stem cell. Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

Q Does the maintenance program continue on indefinitely?
A I guess it could. I would think that -- I don't -- there's
no reason for me to believe that if it's a genetic problem
it's just going to go away, so I guess we're prepared for
it to go on indefinitely, but we haven't discussed, you
know, is that going to indeed be the case.

Q Is it once a month or once a week?
A No, weekly.

Q So -- so once a week for maintenance to keep the metal --
A No, we're able to do it at home.

Q Okay.
A We're able to do it at home.

Q With chelating agent that you get from Dr. Buttar?
A Yes, sir.
FURTHER EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

DR. McCULLOCH: Mr. Hewitt, you mentioned you said you had your child evaluated by the developmental pediatrician.

WITNESS: Pediatrician, Dr. Nancy Powers.

DR. McCULLOCH: Is she an M.D.?

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: He or she?

WITNESS: She.

DR. McCULLOCH: She. Is she aware of this other treatment?

WITNESS: She is aware of the chelation. She was not necessarily for it, but she didn't -- she -- she felt like there wasn't any harm if it was done properly, so she supported us doing it. She was -- I guess, she was very happy with the fact that she's the one that put him on the five medications and the fact that he was off the five medications through, you know, weaned him off and what have you, she thought that there would be some merit to trying, you know, the chelation process and supported that.

She supported the hyperbaric oxygen treatment therapy.

She did not support the umbilical cord blood stem cell
therapy.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt. And we're all delighted your son is doing better.

WITNESS: Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Is there anybody else you want to call that's from out of state? No?

MR. KNOX: No. To be honest with you, we were supposed to talk with Mr. Hewitt tonight and I've got some people I haven't had a chance to talk to who drove here, so if we start at 7:00 in the morning, I'll bet we'll be done and I appreciate that.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. All right. We'll adjourn until 7:00 in the morning.

(WHEREUPON, THE HEARING WAS ADJOURNED)

ON APRIL 23, 2008 AT 6:14 P.M.

TO BE RECONVENED ON APRIL 24, 2008 AT 7:00 A.M.)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Good morning.

MS. GODFREY: Good morning.

MR. JIMISON: Good morning.

MR. KNOX: Good morning.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We will resume in the case of Dr. Buttar. And I wanted to just remind everyone to turn off their cell phones and pagers. I see -- see you doing that that
made me think about it.

Ms. Godfrey and Mr. Knox, are you ready to proceed.

MR. KNOX: Dr. Rhyne, the first thing that we would offer
is an Affidavit of Michelle Reed which she's on standby
because Mr. Jimison has graciously agreed that we could
just admit her affidavit to you. I think it's Exhibit
42, but this is the signed copy of it. If I could hand
up to you a copy of it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Please do. Thank you.

MR. KNOX: You're welcome.

DR. WALKER: Thank you.

MR. JIMISON: Dr. Rhyne, while we're doing some
housekeeping, here's the signed Stipulation and the
Pre-hearing Conference for your copy.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you. I would -- I'd like to take
just a minute or so to look at this.

Okay.

MR. JIMISON: And, Dr. Rhyne, if I may, I spoke to Mr.
Knox about this, I mean just one point about the affidavit.

You know, clearly, Ms. Reed is not here to be
cross-examined and the Board is not able to ask questions
of Ms. Reed. However, in the interest of moving things
along, I agreed to just allow that affidavit to be
submitted.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. JIMISON: I just wanted to make that point.

MR. KNOX: And you may -- that was his -- and he's correct, you don't have the right to cross-examine, but she's on standby at her office to be called. I just thought we would expedite.

This affidavit is made in rebuttal to what Patient B's wife had said about her conversation about Dr. Buttar's practices and how he charged people and so forth and that's what the rebuttal is about. Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Knox and Ms. Godfrey, do you have any more evidence you wish to present?

MS. GODFREY: We would call Dr. John Wilson.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. KNOX: Pull that mike toward you a little bit, so they can hear you.

WHEREUPON,

JOHN L. WILSON, JR., M.D.,

being first duly sworn,

was examined and testified

as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:

Q Could you state your name for the record, please?
A My name is John Layton Wilson, Jr.

Q And, Dr. Wilson, where do you reside?
A I reside in Fairview, North Carolina.

Q Okay. And is that near Asheville?
A It's a bedroom community.

Q Okay. And do you have a copy of your CV there?
A I do not.

Q There is an exhibit book, I believe it's Exhibit 29, so that you could -- I know you know what's on your CV, but for the benefit of the Board and just for the benefit of being able to follow along. Is Exhibit 29 your CV?
A Yes, ma'am.

Q Could you tell the Board where you graduated from college?
A I graduated from college from the University of Minnesota at Duluth with a B.A. degree in zoology and chemistry.

Q And after that did you go to medical school?
A I attended medical school. I was in a charter class at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, Minnesota which is a school that was developed by the legislature with the express purpose of educating rural family physicians.
I graduated from the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis in 1976.

Q With an M.D. degree?
A Yes, ma'am.

Q And then you pursued a residency in family practice?
A Yes.

Q And you completed that residency in what year?
A I completed one year of the residency and went into practice following that.

Q Okay. And did you practice for a period of time in Minnesota?
A I practiced for a period of 14 years in a small town in Minnesota.

Q And after that did you move to North Carolina?

Q And --
A And I've practiced there since.

Q Okay. And you're licensed by the North Carolina Medical Board?
A Yes, ma'am. And I'm also licensed in Minnesota.

Q Aside from your qualifications in family practice, do you also practice in integrative medicine?
A Yes, ma'am.

Q And could you explain to the Board what sparked your interest in integrative medicine and how many years you've been
practicing?

A Well, I think throughout my medical school and early practice years, I had an abiding interest in holistic medicine and looking at the whole person. And in the process of dealing with some of the health challenges in my own family, I developed a greater interest in trying to find alternate ways to get -- to help my own family improve their health.

And when I applied -- and I traveled this country from coast to coast many times and have attended many hundreds of hours of meetings in learning other techniques. And when I started finding my own family members improved their health, I was able to learn that I had numerous patients who had similar problems and I started applying the same principles in their -- in my practice with them and they also improved.

Q Okay.

A And that interest was really sparked probably in the mid 1980s in particular.

Q Okay. So you've been -- been practicing integrative medicine for some 25 years or close to that?

A Close to that.

Q Okay. And have you held any positions in society that promote
integrative medicine?

ASYes, I have.

QWhat positions are those?

AI have served on the Board of Directors of three
organizations -- four organizations in integrative
medicine. The American Academy of Environmental
Medicine, I served on their Board of Directors for perhaps
10 years. I was on the Board of Directors of the formerly
Great Lakes College of Clinical Medicine which changed
its name to the International College of Integrative
Medicine for several years. I have served on the Board
of Directors of the North Carolina Integrative Medical
Society and I'm currently a Board Member of the
International Academy of Oral Medicine and Toxicology.
I have served as past president of the American Academy
of Environmental Medicine and the Great Lakes College
Clinical Medicine. And I served for five and a half years
as the National Director of Continuing Medical Education
for the American Academy of Environmental Medicine.

QOkay. And could you explain to the Board --

MS. GODFREY: Well, first of all, let me tender Dr. Wilson
as an expert in integrative medicine and family practice.

Any objections?
MR. JIMISON: No.

QNow --

(PANEL DISCUSSION BETWEEN
PRESIDENT RHYNE AND DR. McCulloch)

MS. GODFREY: I'm sorry, did you have a question for me?
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, we can go over it now or in the
question period.
MS. GODFREY: Okay.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: But we just don't see where he completed
a residency of family practice or is board certified in
family practice.
MS. GODFREY: Okay.
WITNESS: I did not complete a residency in family
practice, but I have earned the status of a fellow of the
American Academy of Family Physicians.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: But you have not been certified?
WITNESS: Not in family practice.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. So we -- so therefore that's our
issue of accepting him as an authority in family practice.
MS. GODFREY: Okay.

Q(By Ms. Godfrey) Dr. Wilson, in your current practice, do
you use both conventional and alternative therapies on
your patients?
AYes, I do.

QDirecting your attention to some of the therapies that are used commonly as alternative therapies, are you familiar with -- are you familiar with treating patients for toxic conditions?

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd what can you tell the Board about your experience treating patients with toxic conditions as it relates to heavy metals?

AI have had extensive experience doing chelation therapy with patients and depurating toxic metal of the patients, our clinic has administered -- I'm quite certain over a quarter of a million intravenous EDTA chelation infusions over many years and I'm proud to say without adverse reaction or serious complication with any of them.

QAnd in seeking to eliminate heavy metals from your patients, what conditions do you treat with that therapy?

AI think an important distinction to make with -- with the approach of integrative medicine is that we're treating the patient more than we're treating the condition, per se. Toxic metals have a huge impact on many different body systems and in depurating the body burden of heavy metals from patients, many -- many aspects have improved,
anywhere from -- from malignance -- conditions with malignancy to chronic fatigue issues to just many different types of problems.

So it's really not -- I think it's very important to differentiate between integrative medicine and just conventional practices in that conventional medicine is more oriented toward identifying, you know, signs and symptoms and determining, based upon that, which treatments could be used.

And in much of conventional medicine is involving and treating symptoms the patients have in alleviating suffering which of course is completely admirable and desirable and we all do that.

But I think what we do in integrative medicine is a step beyond that is trying to look at what are the burdens on this person's biology by reducing or using the total load on people. It has been my observation and that of my colleagues that many conditions improve. And so by reducing that body burden through these chelations and removing heavy metals results in clinical improvement in a wide range of conditions.

QAre you familiar with nutritional therapies?

AYes, ma'am.
Q: Could you explain to the Board how they are used by integrative medicine doctors?

A: Well, I think in the larger picture we see illness as a manifestation of overburden of different aspects of people's health. You know, I mean you look at -- go from trauma to pregnancy to infections, parasites to toxic substances to sensitivities, hypersensitivities, and allergies to essential factor deficits such as nutrients, micronutrients, macronutrients, and we look at the broad spectrum of those who need to address micronutrient deficiencies through both oral and intravenous therapy.

Q: Are you familiar with the treatment by -- that is abbreviated IRR?

A: Yes, ma'am.

Q: Can you tell the Board what that is and how you know that?

A: IRR is a term coined by Dr. Harry Philbert. Dr. Philbert is a physician now in his eighties and he actually discovered this autonomic reflex back when he was in his twenties and he practices outside of New Orleans, Louisiana. And he coined the term infra -- infraspinatus respiratory reflex.

And at that -- back at that point in time, Dr. Philbert was and still is just a remarkable individual who has a
photographic memory of anatomy. I don't think there's a nerve or a vein, or a muscle origin or insertion that he doesn't know where it's at. He can picture it immediately.

But he -- because of his interest in anatomy, he started doing a lot of work in his twenties looking at trigger point therapy and he identified a autonomic nerve reflex in the belly of the infraspinatus muscle. He actually went to the -- to the lab, the veterinary lab, at the University of Louisiana and -- and would do experiments with dogs and also with rabbits and he would inject the infraspinatus muscle trigger points in these animals with local anesthetics.

He would actually -- what he actually -- one of his really interesting experiments is where he -- he injected an irritant solution, a dilute phenol solution into the -- into the infraspinatus reflex region of dogs and the dogs went into congestive heart failure. And they actually -- they just -- they actually died following that irritation of that nerve reflex and this was confirmed by -- by the veterinary pathologist.

He went back to the lab and did the same experiment again and after he had irritated that reflex, he actually
injected it with lidocaine and completely reversed the findings.
And he started doing it -- so patients who had asthma, for instance, he would treat that reflex and his asthma patients improved.
He actually showed this or kept good records over many years and treated over 4,000 asthmatic patients over many years and found that 80 percent of the patients with asthma would show improvement from the IRR injections and they would have -- it improved peak flow following the injections as compared to before.
And he also found that -- that half of those patients who responded were able to get off all of their asthmatic medications. And so he actually found that this injection helped a number of different conditions.

QNow, do you perform IRRs?
AI have performed IRRs since I spent three days training with Dr. Philbert perhaps 10 or 12 years ago.
QAnd what types of patients do you find this treatment helps?
AIRR therapy, as I mentioned, can be a tremendous benefit for -- for asthma. I have found -- I actually think it's one of the best kept secrets in medicine. I think it's unfortunate that medical students are not taught this
technique. It's a dramatic and usually immediate benefit that patients ever -- incurred in the patient's improvement from that treatment.

I found it's also very useful for chronic pain conditions in the shoulder and the neck region.

And the theory is that, you know, we have sort of developed with this injection is that the -- that the autonomic -- when trigger points occur in that muscle -- in the belly of the infraspinatus muscle, an autonomic hypervigilant state is set up that puts the paraspinal autonomies into a state of sympathetic hypervigilance. The injection relaxes that entire -- that entire region.

We've seen shoulder pain and neck pain substantially improve from these injections, algias of the upper extremities, for instance.

It can be helpful for patients who have malignancy, particularly if they have malignancies in the lungs and Dr. Philbert has done that with a number of his -- I don't know his statistics, per se, but many patients he's seen that had lung cancer have had a substantial improvement in their breathing following the treatment.

QAnd would the same be true with patients that were -- had other cancers that have metastasized to the lung?
A: Of course.

Q: You were asked to be an expert witness in this case, correct?
A: That's correct.

Q: And I sent you a great deal of material to review. Do you -- did you review the Medical Board charges in this case?
A: I did.

Q: And did you review the opinion of Dr. John Peterson?
A: Yes, I did.

Q: Okay. The sheets that he -- he provided to the Medical Board, correct?
A: Yes.

Q: And with regard to Patients A, B, C and D, did you review their medical records from Dr. Buttar's office?
A: I did.

Q: Did you also review their billing statements?
A: I did.

Q: And did you review the Medical Board investigative file on those patients?
A: I did.

Q: Okay. Now, after review of all of that information, some, I think, a thousand pages that was sent to you on a CD, do you have an opinion within a reasonable degree of medical certainty of whether or not Dr. Buttar's diagnosis and
treatment of Patient A was within the standard of care for a doctor practicing integrative medicine in North Carolina in 2006?

MR. JIMISON: Objection, just to note that it's an incorrect legal standard. I'll just note the objection.

Q(By Ms. Godfrey) You may answer the question, Doctor.

AI do have an opinion.

QAnd what is that opinion?

AI believe that Dr. Buttar's therapies and choice of therapies and treatments in these patients would fall within the usual framework of the types of treatments that integrative doctors that I know that have experience dealing with and treating that would indicate that was appropriate.

QOkay. And with regard to Patient A, did you review Dr. Peterson's critiques and opinions as they relate to Dr. Buttar's treatment of Patient A?

AYes, I did.

QAnd do you agree with Dr. Peterson?

AI do not.

QCould you tell the Board why?

AI believe one of the criticisms that has been levied against Dr. Buttar, really not just to Patient A, but all three of the cancer patients, is an unjust criticism and I think
highlights the different yardstick by which integrative medicine is judged as compared to conventional standard.

The conventional standard for this patient -- for all three of these patients who had Stage IV terminal disease was to refer them to a hospice unit and let them be in the hospice unit until death.

Dr. Buttar was approached by all of these patients that were seeking these treatments and they -- they went into it with full knowledge, they knew what they wanted to get, they were fully informed about what the treatments would involve, what the costs would be and they chose to do that.

I think to without -- physicians who have something to offer to patients to improve their quality of life, to withhold that from them, I think is not correct. I think his position is -- if that's the conventional standard is to -- is to basically relegate people to the morgue, I think it's the incorrect standard and I think the standard should be expanded to allow people the freedom to make those choices.

So that was my major argument with Dr. Peterson's opinion of Dr. Buttar's supposed violation of the conventional
standard.
The conventional therapies failed in all of these patients.

And I just -- I'm not comfortable sitting in a position
of being -- playing God with any patient. If they want
to make -- they have a right to make informed choices,
I think they should have -- they should be given that right.

QOkay. With regard to Dr. Peterson's opinion as it relates
to Dr. Buttar's practice with these patients and his
physician contact with the patients, did you see documented
in the chart that Dr. Buttar was, in fact, -- or did you
see any documentation in the chart as to whether or not
Dr. Peterson's opinion could be supported?

AWell, I'm puzzled by -- by Dr. Peterson's comments about Dr.
Buttar, number one, not using SOAP notes and the charts
are full of SOAP notes and -- and that Dr. Buttar never
saw the patients.
You know, Dr. Buttar performed all of the IRR injections,
for instance, on these patients. And I don't know how
one could read those charts and not come to the conclusion
that Dr. Buttar was very much involved with the patient
and the care of these patients.

QOkay. Basically you covered my questions as they relate to
Patients A, B and C. I originally asked you as to Patient A, but I think in your answers you went on and told us that you feel the same way about Patients B and C as regards to the standard of care.

I want to focus for just a minute on Patient D, the non-cancer patient. First of all, do you have an opinion to a reasonable degree of medical certainty as to whether or not Dr. Buttar's diagnosis and treatment of Patient D was within the standard of care for a doctor practicing integrative medicine in North Carolina in 2006?

I believe it was.

Okay. And do you -- can you explain why you hold that opinion?

The types of therapies that were brought to -- to her care, I don't have her -- her record in front of me or the summary but --

Okay.

So I'd have to refresh my memory a bit with that specific case.

But as with the other cases, as well, the kinds of therapies that were utilized are kinds of therapies that are typically to be used in integrative medicine when you would see a patient and approaching a patient from the standpoint of not what are -- what is your disease and which -- what
treatment are we going to use to specifically focus on
your disease, but where -- but the kinds of treatments
that we'll be looking at, what the body -- this person's
body burden is and how can you reduce that.
You know, one point I'd like to make in that regard, you
know, I think it was about four years ago that the
environmental working group published a paper where they
studied the cord blood of ten infants -- I don't know if
any of you saw that paper -- but they identified in these
infants that -- that there were over 200 toxic pollutants
in the blood of these infants.
That's how people in our society start life and that number
increases substantially as we go through -- as we go through
life by simply the acts of eating, breathing, drinking
and touching. We are living in a world full of pollutants
and these things slowly and gradually and chronically
accumulate in our system and the accumulation of the
pollutants interferes with biologic function. If these
pollutants are removed, biological function improves.
This is the basic premise of environmental medicine and
of integrative medicine. That by reducing the burden of
these, patient's physiology improves. Again, it's one
of the numerous stressors on the human biology that, you
know, I had mentioned earlier in the list of things
including micronutrient deficiencies, trauma, stress, all
these things that we look at.
And I think it's an important point to mention that, when
you're -- when you're looking at somebody who comes in
for the symptom of fatigue or if they come with a symptom --
whatever their symptoms may be, however the body makes
-- expresses an illness, there's an underlying reason.
I think it's another very important differentiating point
between conventional and alternative medicine.
Conventional medicine is symptom focused and integrative
medicine is really more looking at the bigger picture,
you know, why do things happen the way they do in the body
and how can we reduce the stressors on the body.
And it has been the experience of those of us who have
done this for many years, that many people improve their
physiology functioning. Are we curing disease? I don't
think so. I think we're lessening the body burden and
we're allowing people a better chance to operate and
function in life with the remaining burdens that they have.

MS. GODFREY: I think that's all the questions I have.

Marcus, do you have any.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:
Q: Good morning, Dr. Wilson. Thank you for coming in so early.
A: Good morning.
Q: Dr. Wilson, you don't have any special training in oncology, correct?
A: I do not.
Q: You've never done the residency or fellowship or anything like that in oncology?
A: I have not.
Q: And you're not an expert in cancer, are you?
A: Not at all.
Q: And yet you treat patients with cancer, don't you?
A: I treat patients and if they have -- if my patients develop cancer, I will do what I can to assist them with them fully understanding that I'm not an oncologist and that I insist actually that my patients be followed by an oncologist if I'm going to be continuing to provide any supportive therapy for them.
Q: So when patients come to you, you treat them and you hope their cancer gets better, correct?
A: Of course.
Q: Okay. But you don't treat their cancer directly?
A: No. I treat their underlying biology and hope that we'll see improvement in immune function from the treatments that
we can offer and the body can better cope with the
malignancy, that their body has expressed -- expressed
in their situation.

Q And so you told patients up front that you're not an expert
in cancer and you're not treating their cancer clinically?
A Of course.

Q And so is it achromatic that a doctor should only treat diseases
for which he has training to treat?
A Please restate that question.

Q It is sort of an acumen of truth that doctors should only treat
those diseases for which he has training to treat?
A I think the doctor should treat patients in a manner in which
they are -- are trained and for which they have knowledge.

Q For instance --
A Again, another important concept in integrative medicine, I
see, is on the marquis of the North Carolina Medical Board,
the Primum Non Nocere, we take it very seriously, above
all, do no harm.

Q A doctor who's doing neurosurgery should probably be trained --
be trained in neurosurgery before he does neurosurgery?
A I would hope.

Q Colorectal surgery, a doctor should be trained in that before
he does that?
AI would hope so.

Q All right. Infectious disease or anesthesiology?

A Of course.

Q And so if a doctor is treating cancer, he should probably be trained in oncology, correct?

A If a doctor is treating cancer, a doctor should be trained in oncology.

But if a doctor is treating patients and not the cancer primarily, even providing support of care, I think they should be trained in those fields as well, in those areas.

Q Isn't it true that Dr. Buttar advertised and said he treats cancer?

A I am not familiar with Dr. Buttar's advertisements.

Q All right. Isn't it true that he holds himself out as a doctor who treats cancer?

A I'm not sure what Dr. Buttar holds himself out as. He holds -- to my knowledge, he holds himself out as an integrative doctor.

Q Are you familiar with Dr. Buttar's seminar where he has a seminar called Innovative Protocols for Treating Chronic Disease, Cancer, Cardiovascular and Neurodegenerative Disease?

A I have seen that brochure.
Q So would this be an advertisement that he holds himself out as treating cancer?
A I think it would be an advertisement for -- for the integrative medicine that's presented in the seminar he's conducted.
Q Protocols of treatment.
A Whatever the seminar is teaching. I have not taken that seminar.
Q Okay. And cancer is a -- if you -- you weren't here for Dr. Peterson's testimony, correct?
A I was not.
Q Okay. You had critiques of Dr. Peterson from his deposition, but you weren't here to listen to him testify?
A That's correct.
Q And he testified about the heterogenous characteristics of cancer. Is cancer a single disease or is it many diseases?
A Is it a single disease or what?
Q Is it a single disease or is it many diseases?
A What's the adjective, I'm sorry?
Q Many.
A Cancer is an immune system dysfunction. Ultimately it boils down to that and it is -- it has many potential manifestations.
Q So cancer is a symptom of a bad immune system?
AYes. An immune system that is not functioning properly, if you want -- if that's how you term a bad immune system.

QSo under your understanding of cancer, it being a symptom of the immune system of a poor immune system, if the patient has brain cancer or liver cancer or lung cancer or ovarian cancer, cervical cancer, all those cancers can be treated with a single protocol?

AThat is not what I said.

QOkay. And on there -- are there therapies that can treat all different cancers no matter what type cancer it is?

AThere are many therapies that are used to provide immune support for patients.

QSo if you have a protocol that's just to increase the immune system, that can treat all cancers?

AIf you have a protocol that provides improvement of immune system communication, a patient who has cancer which is a manifestation of an impaired immune system communication, their situation would very likely improve.

QOkay. And you --

AA properly functioning immune system will not allow -- will not allow the cancer to develop.

QSo hydrogen peroxide therapy would be a treatment for cancer or the immune system?
AHydrogen peroxide therapy has been used for treating immune
disregulations that manifest as malignancy to my
knowledge.
I do not hold myself as an expert in hydrogen peroxide
therapy. I do not do it my practice.
QAnd ozone therapy, would that be a treatment for the immune
system?
AOzone therapy is another oxidated therapy that I have no
familiarity with other than what I've learned in seminars
that I've attended, but I've never utilized it in my
practice so I cannot even comment on that therapy.
QAnd hyperbaric chambers, would that be a therapy for cancer?
AI'm familiar with that. Familiar with the use of hyperbaric
therapy in treating patients who have cancer.
QAnd these IRR injections, is that a therapy for cancer?
APatients who have cancer that have metastatic cancer that
doesn't -- or a primary that involves the lung and results
in immune -- in respiratory function compromise will
benefit from an IRR injection, very likely.
QAnd these -- these therapies that you testified and when Ms.
Godfrey asked you that when you reviewed the charts, Dr.
Buttar was within integrative medicine standard, yet,
you're not familiar with these therapies and you don't
use them in your practice.

AI'm familiar with the therapies, but I don't use them in my practice and so I don't have patient experience with those therapies.

Again, I have served as National CME Director for an American Medical Society and I have in that role have invited physicians into the academy to speak to on these issues. I've heard many presentations over the years and I think the -- in my opinion, these therapies have a lot -- a lot of potential value.

QYou don't have any firsthand experience with them, though?

AI have very limited firsthand experience.

QDo you have some experience? I mean, is it zero or some?

AWell, years ago. Many years ago. I probably haven't done hydrogen peroxide therapy in my practice for 15 years.

QAnd why not?

AIt is a therapy that has risen -- risen above the radar screen for many physicians in this -- in this country for political reasons and the medical boards have -- have found it a fairly favorite target of therapy to attack physicians for and I'm not -- I can get along without those therapies in my practice and help patients within the scope that are not as high profiled or politically dangerous is the
word I used in my deposition, I believe.

Q And have any of these therapies proven effective by any double-blind placebo-controlled studies?

A What are any of these therapies you are referring to on this?

Q The hydrogen peroxide, the ozone therapy, the hyperbaric chambers, fusion and minerals and vitamin C.

A Well, I don't have an encompassing view of all of the -- all of the studies that have been performed that are in voluminous literature volumes, so I really can't comment about that. I can say that I'm not familiar with the studies that are -- that are putting on with that regard.

I will mention that the NIH is currently in the middle of a $30 million clinical trial on a double-blind placebo-controlled trial for the use of EDTA chelation therapy for treating coronary artery disease and that trial is currently to be underway.

Q The thin notebook, if you could grab this thin notebook over here and turn to Tab 17. It's the Board's thin notebook, Tab 17. Okay. Do you recognize that entitled --

A Yes, I do.

Q And this is your deposition?

A Yes, it is.
Q: If you could turn to page 36, it's on page 4 in the top right-hand corner. If you go to page 36.

A: Okay.

Q: You indicated that a double-blind placebo-controlled trial is the gold standard in medicine, correct?

A: That is generally the -- has been for years, what's considered the gold trial -- the gold standard for evaluating pharmaceutical agents.

Q: So drug therapies is the gold standard for determining whether drug therapies work or not?

A: Correct.

Q: So we're not talking about double-blind placebo-controlled studies for surgery or, you know, bypass or some sort of surgical procedure, we're talking about drug therapy, correct?

A: Well, it has been performed on surgical procedures through the, you know, double-blind studies have been done on surgical procedures, for instance.

Q: It mostly is, in fact, the gold standard for drug therapies and development of drug therapies?

A: Correct.

Q: And -- and then on page 37, I asked you: Did any of these therapies, hydrogen peroxide, ozone, the miscellaneous
therapies that actually you were not familiar with, that
you --
AI didn't say I'm not familiar with that.
QWell, let me just read the question down to line 16 on page
37. But the therapies that you listed for Patient A, the
hydrogen peroxide, the ozone, the miscellaneous therapies
with all the initials that you were not familiar with,
have any of those therapies been subject to what you call
the gold standard of medicine which is a double-blind
placebo-controlled study?
And your answer was --
AI am not aware that they have, but my lack of awareness does
not necessarily mean that they haven't.
QAnd I went to page 38 and I asked you whether these therapies --
and it says element, but I think I might have mispronounced
the word "ailment". But I asked you if any of these
therapies have been subjected to double-blind
placebo-controlled studies for any other ailment except
for cancer.
And your answer was the same, correct?
ACorrect.
QSo none of these therapies have been subjected to double-blind
placebo-controlled studies to improve the immune system
either, correct, to your knowledge?

ATo my knowledge. But I will also add that there are -- that
the double-blind placebo-controlled model does not work
as a waiver of evaluating all types of therapies that can
be applied to human beings.
The therapy is not practical for a number of different
reasons especially if you're looking more holistically
at patients in terms of, you know, what's happening with
them.
Now, I would like to add to that, that when we talked --
the purpose of the double-blind placebo-controlled study,
to the best of my knowledge, is to -- is to separate the,
quote, unquote, real effects of a particular therapy
against the placebo effects of the therapy and however
you may define placebo effects.
Placebo effect seems to me as a -- ultimately as the healing
power of the mind and it would seem to me if we could find
ways of harnessing the healing power of the mind, we would
be enhancing the quality of health as well.
QSo Dr. Buttar is basically just practicing placebo therapies?
AI didn't say that. What I said --
QBut --
A-- what I said is that the patient -- is the double-blind
placebo-controlled study is not the only model that can be used to study and evaluate the effectiveness of particular therapies.

Many -- many integrative therapies and this has been endorsed by the National Center for Complimentary Alternative Medicine, NIH, use the SF36, the Special Form 36 which is basically a way of evaluating a patient's symptom -- you know, as groups of patients symptoms respond to different therapies.

There are -- there are other models by which -- by which therapies can be studied. I'm not aware of all of the different studies that have been done. There are millions of studies that have been put into literature and no single physician could possibly have the encompassing view of all of that.

QAnd going back to the placebo, did you review anything regarding Dr. Ripoll's testimony or her testimony yesterday?

AI reviewed her testimony. I was --

QAre you familiar with her?

AYes, ma'am -- yes, sir.

QAnd from your understanding what is the amount of hydrogen peroxide that Dr. Buttar would use to treat patients?

AIt's a very small quantity. I mean, the standard therapy of
that, from my knowledge of hydrogen peroxide therapy, even though I'm not doing it in my practice, is a very little dose. It's 1 cc of 3 -- 1 cc of three and a half percent solution of hydrogen peroxide. That is added to 100 cc of -- (inaudible) -- and that is what's used.

QAnd when hydrogen peroxide hits the blood it immediately dissipates, correct, into -- into hydrogen peroxide and oxygen?

AI am not prepared to testify about the physiology of hydrogen peroxide. I think I've already stated that I don't hold myself as an expert in this field.

QThe -- well, let's go to something you know about family practice. When you get a cut on your hand and you run into your house and get the hydrogen peroxide out of the medicine cabinet and you pour the hydrogen peroxide on the cut, what normally happens?

AIt has a fizzy and bubbling effect.

QIt bubbles up and that's because it's being immediately -- there's a chemical reaction as to basically transforming into just water, correct?

AAgain, I think I will -- I'll go back to my previous comments that I'm not holding myself as an expert in this piece. Hydrogen peroxide in dilute solutions that are used do
not -- does not cause a bubbling effect in the blood --
in the blood stream.

I would quite concur with Dr. Ripoll's opinion of hydrogen
peroxide that when normal cells encounter hydrogen
peroxide, the catalasing enzyme that was present in normal
cells can easily dissipate and eliminate it.
The hydrogen peroxide even in very dilute amounts that
are used causes mischief with certain kinds of cells,
infectious agents or, you know, viruses and bacteria and
malignant cells will adversely be effected because they
do not have the catalytic enzyme system to be able to
destroy the hydroxolode free radicals.

QAre you familiar with the proceedings in the National Academy
of Science?
AI reviewed it.

QDid you review the article about pharmacologic absorbic
concentrations likely kills cancers cells? Did you review
this article?
AI just saw this in the -- I never reviewed the article, I
reviewed the abstract.

QWould you be familiar with any study from the abstract that --
that no matter how much hydrogen peroxide you put into
the blood it immediately transforms to water and oxygen?
AIt's been some weeks since I've read that and I don't have --
I don't have a specific recollection of that. I think
I established already that I'm not holding myself in any
particular expert status of really evaluating this other
than from what I had learned from reading this.

QSo from your understanding of reviewing the testimonies, when
hydrogen peroxide, especially as a very, very low
concentration that Dr. Buttar uses when it's infused into
the blood system, which he's doing, he's infusing it into
the blood stream, it is immediately turned into just
basically nothing more than saline, correct?

MS. GODFREY: Objection. Objection. I mean, we've been
over this about four times and it's sort of old and we
object to --

QWell, let me -- let me ask it -- well, let me ask it this way,
Dr. Wilson.

If it is immediately turned into saline and the hydrogen
peroxide is not finding its way to the cancer cells,
essentially all that's being done is that saline is being
injected and, at most, all you can have is a placebo
effect --

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection.

MR. JIMISON: That's a good question.
MS. GODFREY: He just -- he's just testified he's not an expert in hydrogen peroxide. He is an expert in other integrative therapies and in integrative medicine.

QBut I'm asking just from your experience as a doctor, if the hydrogen peroxide immediately goes into water and if that's all that's going into the body because it immediately catalases when it gets into the blood stream, at most, all you're hoping for is a placebo effect?

AI think you'll have better luck with this line of questioning with Dr. Biddle who I think has more knowledge about this field. I'm quite aware that the -- there are very many complex mechanisms that are in play when hydrogen peroxide is given and it effects the redox system in cells. And I've heard this -- I heard this explained numerous times and I have not quite gotten my mind around all of the different intricacies of this, but it is not what you are trying to label it as which is a placebo effect.

I personally like the placebo effect. I'm interested in anything that could be used to help my patients heal and I will utilize the placebo effect if I can, but I'm unsure the interest of using it alone is something that's going to have a real biological effect.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, I think you can move on.
MR. JIMISON: I will move on.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) With Patient D, did --

APatient which?

QD, the non-cancer patient. Is it true that Dr. Buttar never saw this patient?

AThat's my understanding.

QNow, you're also a member of the North Carolina Integrative Medical Society?

ACorrect.

QAnd Dr. Buttar is a member of that organization?

AYes.

QDr. Biddle --

AYes.

Q-- is a member of that organization.

In fact, all three of you know one another?

AYes.

QAnd you all go to conferences with one another?

AYes.

QYou're friends?

AYes.

MR. JIMISON: I have nothing further.

MS. GODFREY: I just have a few.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:
QDr. Wilson, in your -- in your work with the North Carolina Integrative Medical Society, were you involved in the effort in 2003 to appear before the Legislature to change --

MR. JIMISON: Objection, relevancy.

MS. GODFREY: Well --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No, go ahead.

MS. GODFREY: Can I finish the questions?

Q-- change the law in North Carolina as it relates to the Medical Board and the recognition of integrative medicine?

AI was.

QOkay. And was Dr. Buttar also involved in that effort?

AYes.

QAnd as a result of your efforts, was the law in North Carolina changed in 2003?

AYes, it did.

QAnd is one of the changes that -- that integrative medicine is now recognized in the General Statutes as a separate type of medicine --

MR. JIMISON: Objection, that's incorrect. That's way beyond the expertise of this witness. He's not an expert on law.

MS. GODFREY: Well, he was involved in the effort to change the law.
MR. JIMISON: But everybody -- there's lots of people that talk to the legislatures. I mean, the law speaks for itself. He's not an expert in the law.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: True. He's not held himself as an law expert.

MS. GODFREY: Okay.

Q (By Mr. Knox) Let me just phrase the question this way. As a result of your efforts and the efforts of Dr. Buttar, Dr. Wilson, was this definition of integrative medicine inserted into the Chapter 90 of the North Carolina General Statutes: Integrative medicine, a diagnostic or therapeutic treatment that may not be considered a conventionally accepted medical treatment and that a licensed physician in the physician's professional opinion believes may be of a potential benefit to the patient, so long as the treatment poses no greater risk of harm to the patient than the comparable conventional treatments. Is that change in the law part of your efforts?

AYes. Yes, ma'am, it was. I think the purpose of the statute, but, yeah --

MR. JIMISON: Well, objection. The law speaks for itself. He's not qualified to talk about the purpose of the
AOur intention --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No, no, no.
MR. JIMISON: No.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No, I think -- you're not a legal expert or a legislative expert.

MS. GODFREY: Thank you, Dr. Wilson.

WITNESS: All right.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Any Board Members?

DR. McCULLOCH: I have a couple.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Oh, excuse me, I'm sorry. Did you --

MR. JIMISON: No, ma'am.

MS. GODFREY: Do you have any questions of Dr. Wilson?

MR. KNOX: Yes.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Dr. McCulloch.

EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

DR. McCULLOCH: I'm just curious as far as your background. You did not complete a family practice residency. You went to one year of internship, correct?

WITNESS: Well, one year of family practice residency.

DR. McCULLOCH: And so how did you become a fellow in family practice? I'm just curious about that process.

WITNESS: I completed all of the educational requirements
and there was a period of time before the residency required
was -- requirement was imposed to achieve fellowship status
and I got in before that deadline. I was accepted as a
fellow before that deadline.

DR. McCULLOCH: So you were grandfathered in before it
became an accepted --

WITNESS: Before it was part of -- no, it was accepted --
it was accepted, but there was a grandfather period where
those who had been in practice for a period of time that
they could apply for it and receive fellowship status if
they completed the educational requirements and I got in
under that deadline. I think a year after I got my
fellowship, a full completion of the family practice
residency was required.

DR. McCULLOCH: All right. You're a diplomat of the
International Board of Environmental Medicine?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: How did you become that?

WITNESS: By having taken extensive course work in
environmental medicine and having passed both written and
oral examinations.

DR. McCULLOCH: So there was an examination for that?

WITNESS: Yes.
DR. McCULLOCH: Same thing for clinical metal toxicology?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: And the same thing for neural therapy. These are just things I'm not familiar with and I wanted to clear that up a little bit.

Why do you not use hydrogen peroxide therapy? You mentioned the political climate.

WITNESS: Well, that is -- that is the reason why because I think it is -- it is a therapy that does have a lot of promise and it can be beneficial. Many years ago when I did use it or when I did use it, to some limited extent, I was quite impressed by the effectiveness that it had for instance treating acute influenza. It could very, very rapidly improve that patient's influenza status and for acute viral infections.

DR. McCULLOCH: But it's, I guess, not worth it as far as you're concerned given the risks in your traditional practice?

WITNESS: Right.

DR. McCULLOCH: Do you have an opinion as to why that's a target?

WITNESS: I think it's a target because it's -- I mean, there are different things that are selected as targets
from -- from medical boards across the country and that just happens to be one that has risen to a level of awareness among a number of different staffs for medical boards.

DR. McCULLOCH: So you basically don't --

WITNESS: I think -- I personally think it's based on bias, is what I think it's based on. I think bias exists in all human endeavors including legislators and including physicians --

DR. McCULLOCH: Medical boards.

WITNESS: -- including boards, of course, you know. It's part of being human.

DR. McCULLOCH: All right.

WITNESS: And I'd like to also say that I'm sympathetic to the plight of people who serve on medical boards. I think it's a very difficult thing and whenever you're standing in judgment of others, it's just -- it's a tough thing because you know you're trying to balance reasonable fairness against protecting the public's interest and I appreciate that.

DR. McCULLOCH: Thank you. You mentioned studies and you mentioned some studies that are ongoing about EDTA, the treatment for coronary artery disease. It seems to me that you're willing to put the cart before the horse.
We're using lots of therapies and there are not studies to support those therapies, these --

WITNESS: Well, I think there are a lot of studies. I know that -- you know, that there have been over 45,000 studies that have been published. You're looking at the utility of EDTA chelation therapy for -- for doing -- for treating cardiovascular disease, but there are studies from foreign journals, there's studies from other places that many of them are not of the United States that have shown the efficacy of that therapy.

And I think -- you know, if you think of a study ultimately as treating a patient and -- and what is a study, but you know it's doctors from seeing the effects on large masses of people.

You know, I've had a lot of experience watching EDTA chelation therapy with patients and you know, my experience with it is that it's extremely safe and patients have benefited tremendously from it. You know, not everybody benefits, but not everybody benefits from any conventional therapy either.

DR. McCULLOCH: True. Would it be unfair for me to characterize the practice of integrative medicine as a willingness to use therapies that seem to have an effect,
but have not been proven in scientific endeavors?

WITNESS: I think I would add a caveat to that which says that it would say that would have to be very huge safety profile.

DR. McCULLOCH: So you agree with what I said, but adding --

WITNESS: I think that -- with that many integrative therapies are -- that are being explored today, the practices are going to be the therapies of the future.

I really do believe that, but I think that that is -- that not everything is -- you know, it has -- you know, I think that when you're dealing with pharmaceutical agents, you know, the potential for harm is far greater than when you're talking about treating people with nutrients, for instance. The forgiveness factors in the body are tremendously more. And so I think that, you know, to say that I would soften the conclusion that -- that you're presenting in that regard because I think that the safety factor is number one with patients.

DR. McCULLOCH: Okay.

WITNESS: And in the case of all four of these patients, you know, none of them were harmed either, that I could determine.

DR. McCULLOCH: Last question. Would you feel that it
would be inappropriate to tell a patient that you can treat
their cancer successfully?

WITNESS: I would think it inappropriate to tell a patient
that.

DR. McCULLOCH: Thank you.

WITNESS: I have never said anything like that to any
patient. As a matter of fact, I make no promises to
anybody. I always approach my patients with the same sense
of cautious optimism, you know, we can try these things
if you're interested and I can tell you what the -- what
I see are the pros and the cons and I think that, you know,
any physician would want to be honest with patients, as
a matter of fact.

DR. McCULLOCH: I'm sorry, I do have another question.
Are you familiar with the integrative medicine program
at Duke?

WITNESS: I have some familiarity with it.

DR. McCULLOCH: Do you consider that a --

WITNESS: Well, I'm aware that --

DR. McCULLOCH: -- a --

WITNESS: I'm aware that it -- that it exists. I don't
have -- that's my extent of knowledge with it.

DR. McCULLOCH: Do you --
WITNESS: I heard some -- I heard some of the presenters speak at the state meetings.

DR. McCULLOCH: National Centers for Complimentary and Alternative Medicine, are you familiar with that?
WITNESS: I'm familiar with that, yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: Is that a legitimate organization?
WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: How about Mark Micozzi, Executive Director of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia?
WITNESS: I have -- I've read some of his articles and -- that I've seen in journals and I've heard his name.

DR. McCULLOCH: In a textbook perhaps, Fundamentals of Complimentary and Alternative Medicine?
WITNESS: I've heard of him.

DR. McCULLOCH: Okay. Do you consider those reasonable experts and authorities in integrative medicine?
WITNESS: Well, they're people who bring prominence to the field.

DR. McCULLOCH: If none of those organizations recognized hydrogen peroxide therapy, would you be surprised by that?
WITNESS: I'm not familiar with what position on that or what they published on it at all.

DR. McCULLOCH: All right.
WITNESS: I am not familiar.

DR. McCULLOCH: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Dr. Walker?

DR. WALKER: Dr. Wilson, of the boards that you are a diplomat of, are any of those recognized by the American Board of Medical Specialties?

WITNESS: Not at the current time, but I know that, you know, there are some efforts that that is being looked at to move in that direction.

DR. WALKER: So, no?

WITNESS: Not currently.

DR. WALKER: Do you believe that when you are an expert when you're treating someone for metal toxicity, is there a preferred avenue, a more accurate avenue of determining that person's contamination between urine, blood and say tissue analysis?

WITNESS: Well, I think that blood testing is not accurate for determining body burden. If you look at, you know, the half-life of mercury for instance and the blood is only three and a half days, but the half-life once mercury is partitioned into the nervous system, it can be up to or beyond 30 years.

And I think tissue is ultimately the optimal way to study
it, but that's not practical, clinically, to be taking
pieces of tissue to assay it.

So in the American Board of Clinical Metal Toxicology,
their opinion is that the most effective way to determine
body burden is to challenge the body with a chelating agent
and -- and recover either the urine or the stool to measure
how much has been depurated. Of course, depending on which
chelating agent you're using, which -- which method of
excretion of that agent is involved and which particular
heavy metals you're targeting.

DR. WALKER: Thank you. When you reviewed the records
of Patients A, B and C, you indicated in your answers to
the questions today that you felt that a quality of life
was an appropriate measure of how people respond to these
therapies. In your review did you find any objective
documentation of quality of life issues?

WITNESS: I did -- I cannot say that I saw that indicated
in the records. I saw that there was laboratory
improvements and when you look at the -- the life expectancy
these people had when they first showed to Dr. Buttar's
office in relative to how long they lived, I think they
outlived the expectancy that would have been considered
by the conventional doctors who basically have exhausted
their approach.

DR. WALKER: So --

WITNESS: I think they lived longer. I cannot see anything in the record that tells me about what their quality of life was.

DR. WALKER: Did I mishear you then when you indicated earlier that you didn't believe that laboratory studies were necessarily the best way to follow these patients?

WITNESS: That's one way. I didn't say it's necessarily the best, but there are laboratory parameters, for instance, in the patient who had the dramatic drop in -- in CEA levels.

DR. WALKER: Do you have an opinion as an expert, why IRR, if it seems to be so effective in the treatment of asthma, has not been more widely adopted?

WITNESS: It's just not taught. It's not taught in any medical school. I mean, you know, why it's not taught in medical school, it's just not heard of. You know, there are things that fit into that category that have not -- you know, the effective therapies that have just never been recognized.

DR. WALKER: As an expert in integrative medicine, would you not think it reasonable to be familiar with the
literature in your field if there were studies that were performed in a prospective randomized fashion looking at the very subjects that you -- or the very treatments that you use?

WITNESS: Well, I think I do have some familiarity with the studies that I -- that I come across in the therapies that I do use. As I mentioned with hydrogen peroxide since I'm not using it, I don't focus really attention on that field.

DR. WALKER: So in the areas -- in the treatments that you personally use, are there any randomized prospective studies indicating efficacy of these treatments?

WITNESS: Not that I have seen.

DR. WALKER: Okay. Thank you. Do you refer patients for oxygen therapy?

WITNESS: Oxygen, meaning oxygen therapy?

DR. WALKER: Oxidated hydrogen peroxide, ozone, hyperbaric oxygen, do you refer -- since you don't do those things yourself, do you refer your patients to other physicians who do perform those treatments?

WITNESS: I have referred patients for hyperbaric therapy, but -- when their situations are appropriate for that, but I haven't referred patients for other oxidated
therapies to my knowledge.

DR. WALKER: Thank you.

WITNESS: But -- but there's nobody around me that I'm aware of that really does those therapies and so I would tend to send them elsewhere for that would be imposing -- putting a burden upon them from my region.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Did -- I just want to clarify for my own information. You had talked just a few minutes ago when you were answering Dr. Walker's question about a CEA level dropping. Were you referring to the CA 125?

WITNESS: I'm sorry, that's right. I'm sorry, the CA 125.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. You told us that you're not an expert in oxidated therapies and you don't contend to be an expert in that. What -- what therapies do you see yourself as the expert in?

WITNESS: I think I know a lot about nutritional therapies and I know a lot about heavy metal toxicology.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right. So those are the two things that you would think that your expertise is in?

WITNESS: Yes.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And have you had any -- ever had any problems with nutritional therapies, any overdoses of vitamins? Are you aware of vitamin toxicity?
WITNESS: I have, but I've never had problems with them in the many years I've been doing it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Do -- do you have any -- just looking at quality of life, do you have any objective measurements for quality of life? How do you measure that someone's life has improved?

WITNESS: I think that patients would make that decision about their quality of life.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So it's a subjective thing?

WITNESS: Yes.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

WITNESS: I think it is. Again, SF36 form has been one method that has been endorsed by the NCCA for instance to -- to try to evaluate that, but you know it's -- it is basically a subjective evaluation and trying to track that through changes through time to see that, I think it difficult to really put your finger on the quality of life on how you define it.

I'm sure there are doctors who looked at these things and studied them and come up with conclusions. I just -- I think for me as a practitioner, it's one on one and patients making those decisions themselves.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Who administers the boards that you were
talking about because we had asked if they were affiliated with ABMS and you said no. Who is -- what's the actual organization that administers them?

WITNESS: Well, they're their own organization just like the ABFP is an independent organization, but they do have some affiliation with AAFP.

You know, the International Board of Environmental Medicine has an affiliation with the American Academy of Environmental Medicine only in the fact that they -- they -- they exchange information about what's taught so -- so they know so they can meet certain -- and evaluate candidates and what kind of questions to ask with evaluating candidates for -- for board status, but I -- but they're independently operated.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Now, I was pondering the statement that you had made that there were over 200 toxic metabolites in the cord blood of newborns or of infants and so it just made me wonder a little if -- if indeed that's true, you know, it's a little -- it's a wonder that any -- any children ever make it out of infancy. And do you have any theories or explanations for --

WITNESS: I think it's just reflection of the toxic burden of our times. And, you know, we all have a biology that
was designed to be able to handle certain toxic loads and it's -- you know, you're familiar but I'm sure with the concept of the LD 50 in toxicology. You know, there's a lethal dose of the substance at which 50 percent of the population is death and the remaining 50 percent, some are severely affected and some are moderately affected and some are minimally affected and some are not affected at all by -- by the exposure of that toxin. And the spectrum of tolerance fits in that same scope, you know, that the levels were not necessarily high in these individuals, but there are some individuals for whom that coming into life with that kind of a toxic burden is going to have its effect on them downstream because if that's what they accrued in their bodies in nine months exposure in the womb as they come into the world, they start getting exposed to things, it's going to affect their biology. Ultimately, it's not reasonable to think it can't. Conventional toxicology has been for years very much interested in the concept of acute toxicologic exposure and adverse affects from that. You know, there's -- there's only in recent years has there been an increasing awareness of the slow gradual, you know, insidious bio
accumulation of things through time and how they affect our biology.
And conventionally in medicine, we have not looked at that, you know. Like cancer for instance, you know, 90 -- the American Cancer Society admits that and they have for years -- that 90 percent of cancers are carcinogenic induced and environmental factors that impact our biology. It's where our genes collide with our -- with our environment.
And we -- we don't look at that in medicine, you know.

In conventional medicine we basically identify, you know that you have this cancer and we treat it the same way. You know, that if you have this kind of cancer and it evolved this way, this is the formula for it.

Integrative medicine is recognizing biochemical individuality and we're realizing that no two patients with the same disease are necessarily going to get the same treatment.
And I think that, you know, hopefully medicine will evolve to the point where we can be more knowledgeable about how to apply things individually to patients and understanding individual susceptibilities.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: So you're saying cancer treatments are
pretty standard for the different types of cancers?

WITNESS: Well, that's my understanding from what I've seen of the patients who have cancer, you know, that they are this kind of formula driven.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, that's a little different from what Dr. Peterson told us yesterday --

WITNESS: Well, I didn't hear his testimony.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. All right. I have no further questions. Thank you very much for testifying.

DR. WALKER: Dr. Rhyne, could I ask a question of Ms. Godfrey?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Uh-huh (yes).

MS. GODFREY: Certainly.

DR. WALKER: Would you mind we've -- we've heard both you and Mr. Jimison read the statute relating to integrative medicine.

MS. GODFREY: Yes, Doctor.

DR. WALKER: Would you bear with me, please, and read the entire paragraph relating to integrative medicine that you started reading?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We would like a copy of that. We want a copy --

MS. GODFREY: Okay. And I will be more than happy to --
I would love to hand up, before I close today, a copy of the current version of Chapter 90. Because when I talked to you today at the end of the day, I'm going to highlight some portions of it and because I'm not -- I'm not in my office, I can't -- I don't have a copy machine, but I would love to make a copy of this or have Lynne make a copy --

MR. JIMISON: We can make copies. We can make copies.

MS. GODFREY: -- and hand it up to you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. That would be great.

MS. GODFREY: Because I think you really do need --

DR. WALKER: Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We would like to have that.

MS. GODFREY: Well, this is just a printout from the --

(DISCUSSION OFF RECORD)

MR. KNOX: May I proceed?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Please do go ahead.

MR. KNOX: This is a deposition taken of Erlene Thomas with all the parties present.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Can we go ahead and see that video deposition?

(WHEREUPON, THE VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION

OF ERLENE THOMAS TAKEN ON APRIL 10, 2008,
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Are you ready?

MS. GODFREY: I will hand up -- Mr. Mansfield was nice enough to copy this for us and for you, so these -- this is a copy of the statute that I'm talking about and we will be talking about further.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Thank you. We'll come back to that. Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Ms. Godfrey, ready to proceed?

MS. GODFREY: I am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Mr. Knox, do you have any more evidence that you wish to present?

MR. KNOX: Yes. We would call Ned Jarrett through video.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, THE VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF NED M. JARRETT TAKEN ON APRIL 9, 2008, WAS PLAYED AND IS HEREBY ATTACHED IN ITS ENTIRETY AS EXHIBIT 45)

(DISCUSSION OFF RECORD)
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Knox or Ms. Godfrey, you can proceed.

MS. GODFREY: Thank you, Dr. Rhyne. We would like to call Dr. Buttar.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Is he the last witness or --

Ms. Godfrey: No, we have more witnesses after that, but what we wanted to do is to --

MR. JIMISON: Can I have five minutes to consult for just -- can we just take a five minute break?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Sure.

MR. JIMISON: Until --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Until quarter of 10?

MR. JIMISON: Until quarter of 10.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

(9:35 A.M. - 9:50 A.M. RECESS)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We're back in session.

WHEREUPON,

RASHID ALI BUTTAR, D.O.,

being first duly sworn,

was examined and testified

as follows:
MS. GODFREY: And just for the Boards' benefit, I'm going to be using quite a number of exhibits that are in our exhibit notebook and I'll refer to them by number, so --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: Just to get you keyed up there.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:

Q Could you state your name for the record, please?
A Rashid Buttar.

Q And, Dr. Buttar, are you licensed by the North Carolina Medical Board to practice medicine in the state of North Carolina?
A Yes, ma'am, I am.

Q And how long have you been practicing medicine?
A I graduated from medical school in 1991, so that would be 17 years.

Q Okay. Now, tell -- is Exhibit 1 that's before you, is that your curriculum vitae?
A It's an outdated one, but, yes, it is mine.

Q Okay. What year was that current for?
A I believe it was current for '92 -- I'm sorry to 2005.

Q Okay.
A I would have to go back and look at the schedule to verify that.
QOkay. But -- and I've got to stop saying okay or else we're going to be here all day.

(DISCUSSION OFF RECORD)

AActually, I could tell you this was last updated in 2006.

QOkay. And so it would be -- it would be current and correct for your training and your activities through 2006; is that correct?

AYes, ma'am.

QCould you tell the Board what medical training you -- you received?

AI did three years of postgraduate training in general surgery at Brooke Army Medical Center.

QI'm talking about for medical school.

AOh, I'm sorry, excuse me, ma'am. I went to medical school at the University of Osteopathic Medicine and Health Sciences School of Medicine and Surgery in Des Moines, Iowa.

QAnd did you receive a degree there?

AYes, ma'am, I did.

QAnd following that training, did you do an internship?

AYes, ma'am, I did.

QAnd where was that internship done?

AIT was done at Doctor's Hospital, Airline part of the University
of Texas Health Care System as a transitional cell -- a
transitional year internship at University of Texas.

Q And then you started a general surgery residency?

A Yes, ma'am. But I was pulled for military. I spent a year
in the Republic of South Korea and then I came back to
residency as well.

Q And did you complete that residency?

A No, ma'am, I did not.

Q Tell -- tell the Medical Board why you -- you discontinued
that residency?

A There were a number of reasons. Brooke Army Medical Center
general surgery program that year was rated in the top
three programs in the country. It was a great program.

I loved everything there.

I was trying to save a marriage that was failing and there
were also other professional issues for me personally that
I was going through because I wasn't sure if medicine was
really the right profession for me because from what I
had seen while being in medical school and being in full
student rotations, internship and then a couple of years
of postgraduate training, it didn't seem like we were
really helping people who were -- it was palliative and

I was actually thinking about possibly getting out of
medicine. But I still owed an obligation to the U.S. military, so.

Q: And so -- so after leaving that -- that residency, did you continue on with your military service?

A: Yes, ma'am. I was -- I took a leave of absence for one year to decide what I was going to do. My program chairman at the department of surgery was kind enough to tell me that he would hold my position open as long as I needed and I took a one year leave of absence.

Q: And what did you do during that leave of absence?

A: Unfortunately, the military is not so kind, so they don't let you take a leave of absence. So I was -- since I had already done a hardship tour, they gave me my choice of duty station and I went to Fort Jackson, South Carolina and started working in the emergency medicine department there.

Q: And how long did you -- did you stay in emergency medicine?

A: Well, I continued -- I served out the next three years of my obligation from my -- from my military scholarship obligation and became the chief of emergency medicine at Moncrief Army Community Hospital until I got out in 1996.

Q: After you got out of military, did you become licensed to practice in North Carolina?

A: I was licensed to practice in North Carolina while I was still
Okay. And -- and you became licensed to practice in North Carolina when?

AI believe it was in 1995 because I was moonlighting.

QAnd did you -- once you got out of the military -- decide to move to North Carolina?

AWell, my -- as I said, I was trying to save a failed marriage, that's the reason I took a leave of absence. My family is spread out all over the United States, but my now ex-wife's family was actually from the Charlotte and the West Jefferson area and so her whole family was concentrated in this area. Because Fort Jackson was so close, that's the reason we picked Fort Jackson. It was either at Fayetteville at Fort Bragg or at Fort Jackson and I chose Fort Jackson because actually the driving distance, it was easier to get to Charlotte. And that was the reason I went ahead and got my license here was because I knew that I would eventually end up moving somewhere where my daughter, who was my only child at the time, would have family and so that's why I chose North Carolina and worked the emergency rooms.

QFollowing that or during that period, did you have any
particular training in integrative medicine?

A Actually, not in integrative medicine. My training had been mostly conventional. It was all conventional surgical training. I did spend two months at M.D. Anderson as -- in one of my postgraduate years and I can't remember which one it was. It was three years and also my -- my fourth year into medical school, I also spent -- did a one month rotation there. I did surgical oncology rotation at -- at Baylor.

There were a number of others, all the various types of surgical even though it was for surgical residences, for instance there was time we spent on the urological and medical. There was some -- in my course of training, it was not just like, you know, one year at a time or anything like that.

Q Did you do a fellowship at the Institute of Preventive Medicine?

A Yes, ma'am, I did.

Q Explain to the -- the Board Members what that was.

A The training at -- in Denville that I received, it was a -- it was actually about 14 months. Two months of it was -- actually, I spent two months before the program actually started. It was not a full-time program. I spent from Fridays to Sundays at the Institute of Preventative
Medicine in Denville, New Jersey. This was part of the Capital University program that was in Washington, D.C. which was the only program that had a national recognition in complimentary and alternative medicine. It has no -- it's no longer viable, but it was at that time and the -- the fellowship in alternative medicine was actually just starting then. I think I was in the second class.

Q Now, after you got out of the military, you went into private practice; is that correct? Or after you finished with emergency medicine.

A Well --

Q When did you go into private practice?

A I left the military in 1996 at the age of 29 and I wasn't sure if I was going to continue with medicine or not. But I had over 10,000 documented hours in emergency medicine and I was eligible for the American -- through the American Association of Physician Specialists for board certification in emergency medicine and I had to make a decision to tell the board I was going to sit for the exam or if I was going to leave medicine and go into law. My brother, my sister and my father are all attorneys. I come from six generations of attorneys, so I'm considered the black sheep in my family since I'm a doctor. So I
had to decide which way I was going to go.

But I was quite disenchanted with even emergency medicine people coming in at 2:00, 3:00 in the morning, same problem, how do you continue to contribute to their -- to their misery.

Asking the patient at 2:00 in the morning, have you talked to your regular doctor about this? Yes, I've been talking to my doctor about it for ten years and I still have ischemic neuropathy, I still have pain in my legs, I can't sleep. And I was beginning to not be able to look in the mirror and I was not proud of what I was doing. That was not why I became a physician. That was not what I signed on for.

The reason I wanted to do surgery was because I wanted to be able to see the problem, and look at it, spit on it, throw it on the ground and stomp on it and be done with it, but I kept on seeing, six months later, a year later it would pop back up, so obviously that was not the answer. I knew very early on I wasn't going to do internal medicine, that's for sure.

Q So -- so what direction did you decide to go in your medical practice?

A Well, I didn't really have much of a choice because the only
thing I really knew, I was 29 and I had a family that I had to support and I'd been moonlighting in the emergency rooms. I was making very good money, exceptional money, and so I just continued doing emergency medicine. In the back of my mind, I thought maybe one day I'll save up enough money and maybe I'll open a practice where I can try to do something different.

I used to competitively body-build, natural bodybuilding and had a lot of nutrition and exercise components obviously and so I had an interest in that area. I had given lectures on how people could do certain exercises for their health and their biomechanics and being an osteopathic physician I had some training in that anyway. And so I thought maybe one day I can do that and I don't have to do only conventional medicine.

QAnd did you open a private practice then? Yes or no.
AYes, ma'am, I did.
QOkay. And what -- what are -- what are the goals of the private practice that you -- when you opened it? What did you see yourself doing in medicine?
AWell, our motto is "making the change the world is waiting for" and that is -- at that time it wasn't formulated in those words, but I wanted to do something that I would
be able to look at myself in the mirror and be proud of who I was.

Q And are you proud of yourself today?
A I'm very proud of myself now.

Q And over the last eight or nine years since you've opened the private practice, have you become associated with any organizations that relate to alternative or integrative medicine?
A Extensive, yes, ma'am.

Q Okay. Could you name some of those organizations?
A I'm the chairman of the American Board of Clinical Metal Toxicology that was founded in 1973. I'm the president of the North Carolina Integrative Medical Society that was founded in 2002, I believe. I have sat on various boards from the International College of Integrative Medicine.

I have presented at various conferences. I've sat in the CME committees for four different organizations. I have -- I'm on the currently on the board of the American Association for Health Freedom. I was one of the twelve member task force appointed by the U.S. Congress for the heavy metals in the United States. I can keep on going, but it --
Q: Have you been nominated for any awards for your practice of medicine?
A: I was nominated for the National Institute of Health Directors Pioneer Award. As I understand it, it was the only bipartisan nomination.

Q: Have you testified before Congress on medical subjects?
A: I have testified in front of the U.S. Congress and I've also testified in front of the North Carolina Legislature.

Q: Are you an oncologist?
A: Absolutely not, ma'am.

Q: Do you treat cancer patients with surgery, chemo or radiation?
A: No, ma'am, I do not.

Q: Have you been invited to lecture in conferences dealing with cancer or dealing with alternative therapies for cancer patients?
A: I have lectured at -- I've been invited and I have talked with the NIH a number of times. I have been invited by the Central Disease Control and I met with them twice. I've presented at the American Cancer Society Conference, the 8th Annual Breast Cancer Conference in Puerto Rico. At that time, I was the -- I was the only person that was in private practice. Since then I've received a university appointment.
I've lectured at the Frontiers -- Frontiers in Age Management and Cancer. I believe that's one that you have -- I've lectured in numerous conferences on dealing with patients that have compromised immune system and that are toxic and that are incapable of -- having an inadequate response in chronic disease and cancer happens to be one of them, yes.

Q And we'll get to that in a minute about your philosophy of medicine --

A Yes, ma'am.

Q And how you practice, but I want to get to some more of your credentials. Have you lectured at a conference given by the AC -- ACS?

A Yes, ma'am, that's the American Cancer Society.

Q Yes. Okay, you mentioned that. In your 17 years of practice have you been the defendant in any malpractice cases?

A Never, ma'am.

Q Before this case, have you ever had a complaint before a medical board where you've been licensed to practice?

A Before this, I've never -- if I have, I've never been aware of it, but --

Q Okay. And have you been before this Medical Board before?

A Have you been called before the Medical Board before?
A

MR. JIMISON:  Well, objection, irrelevance.  I don't
think his prior history with the Medical Board is relevant
to the present charges.

MS. GODFREY:  Well, it --

MR. JIMISON:  I mean, he's not charged with anything from
any prior involvement with the Medical Board.

MS. GODFREY:  Well, the relevance is, is that Dr. Buttar
has been examined by this Medical Board before and -- and
-- he is fully -- what this line of questioning is to show
is that he has cooperated with the Medical Board and he
has tried to work within the system and I think --

MR. JIMISON:  She can ask that.  I mean, without getting
into confidential matters that --

MS. GODFREY:  Well, it's not confidential if he's --

MR. JIMISON:  -- are in violation --

MS. GODFREY:  -- if he's testifying to it, it's his --
it's his case.

MR. JIMISON:  Dr. Rhyne, the -- as you know, as all the
Board Members know, the doctor is not even entitled to
his own confidential file until public charges goes out.

So the doctor cannot waive the confidentiality of his
past public file -- or his past file, his confidential
file. If there's anything that's public in the past file, then you know that's public.
But, you know, for instance, doctors come in all the time and want to get a copy of their medical file for like a divorce proceeding or -- or a medical malpractice case and what we've always held consistently to every judge in the state is that the Board's past file, unless made public, is confidential and even the doctor cannot waive that confidentiality to his own file.

MS. GODFREY: We're not bringing the medical file into evidence. We're having Dr. Buttar testify about his experiences with the Board.

MR. JIMISON: But --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You can testify about anything that's public.

MR. KNOX: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Anything that's not public has to be --

MS. GODFREY: Anything that's public?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Uh-huh (yes).

Q (By Ms. Godfrey) Well, did you come here in -- were you called to the Board previously in 2003?

MR. JIMISON: Objection, that's not public. That's not
public information.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Only public information.

MS. GODFREY: Okay.

WITNESS: It was public, ma'am.

Q (By Ms. Godfrey) Well, let me show you Buttar Exhibit 3.

Would you turn to that please?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry, will you say that again?

MS. GODFREY: Exhibit 3.

MR. JIMISON: That is a non-public letter.

MS. GODFREY: It was --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah.

MS. GODFREY: -- it was a letter written to Dr. Buttar

by -- by David Henderson.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: That's -- that's -- that's a

confidential letter.

MS. GODFREY: Well --

WITNESS: It's public.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: It's not -- if it's not on our web site,

it's a not a public document.

MS. GODFREY: It was released to Dr. Buttar and Dr. Buttar

has released it to us. I mean, Dr. Buttar made it public.

MR. JIMISON: He can make it public; however, it's not

a public record for purposes of this Medical Board and
he's not being charged with anything that happened in the past. The present charges don't deal with anything in the past.

MS. GODFREY: We're not talking about charges in the past. We're talking about his ability -- his cooperation with the Medical Board in the past.

MR. JIMISON: You can ask him that. I don't think you can --

MR. KNOX: Well, thank you.

MR. JIMISON: You can ask him if he's cooperated with the Medical Board in the past, but I don't think we can get into the substance of what the Medical Board did in the past.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I agree.

Q(By Ms. Godfrey) Have you cooperated with the Medical Board in the past?

AYes, ma'am, I have fully cooperated with the Medical Board in the past.

QAnd did -- Buttar Exhibit 3, is that a letter that was written to you by David Henderson who's the executive director of the Medical Board?

MR. JIMISON: Objection.

AYes, ma'am, and the --
MR. JIMISON: This was a non-public letter. We're getting into --

WITNESS: Mr. Henderson had told me that my record is not available to me, but if the Board sends me anything it is no longer confidential. I specifically asked before I made this document public.

MR. JIMISON: I think we've dealt with this issue enough.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah.

MS. GODFREY: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We've heard the objection.

MS. GODFREY: Okay. And are you sustaining the objection?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I think the Board's position has always been that any -- our records that are sent to a physician that are not public, are not on the web site, are not public, they are private and they're not to be shared.

MS. GODFREY: All right.

Q(By Ms. Godfrey) Let me turn to Buttar Exhibit 4. And that's a letter written by you, Dr. Buttar, to Tom Mansfield.

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd it's dated March 11th, 2004.

AYes, ma'am.

QCan you tell the Board the occasion you had to write that letter?

AMr. Mansfield and I had exchanged some e-mails after our
testimony in front of the Legislature and one of the questions that I had was that one of the courses that we were teaching required physicians to be able to -- in order to become proficient in a procedure, they would need to be able to do that procedure just by watching it or being -- having it demonstrated would not be sufficient and so I needed an opinion from Mr. Mansfield whether or not I could actually have these doctors do this procedure.

And Mr. Mansfield and I discussed this and he asked me to write him a letter explaining what exactly it was that we wanted. And his opinion was that since doctors are not considered -- as long as a doctor is doing it on -- on each other and they had a medical license to practice in some state, as long as they were at my conference under my license, they could inject each other. They could not inject a patient or a staff member.

QAnd that was -- that was -- and why did you call Mr. Mansfield with that -- with that question?

ABecause at that time we were discussing the -- there were two reasons. One was because I had talked to Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Henderson about having a qualified integrative physician to review charts of integrative physicians because there seemed to be a preponderance of integrative
doctors being questioned by the Board compared to conventional doctors. And so I wanted to make sure that, one, the Medical Board was completely aware of what I was doing.

And, two, that the Medical Board had either given me an approval or the green light to allow me to teach these doctors adequately.

And I also did the same thing with the Board in South Carolina and they also approved it.

Q Now, Dr. Buttar, what is your definition of integrative medicine?

A My definition of integrative medicine is probably as varied as the types of therapies that could be construed as integrative. But to me integrative medicine is taking the best of what I have learned in conventional medicine and what I can possibly learn that may not be widely accepted in order to get the best patient result possible.

Q And what is your philosophy of patient care?

A It is a very serious obligation that I've taken on. I don't like taking an obligation unless I'm willing to be able to put 110 percent behind it.

And I know that when a patient comes to me, they've already gone on the average to 15 doctors before they come to me
and so I know that God is the only healer and I know that he's blessed me, that through his hand that I've been able to help some patients get better and I am very grateful for having to have that opportunity.

Q: Explain your approach to the treatment of patients who present to you with end-stage cancer.

A: My approach is very simple, ma'am. My approach is to find what caused the cancer in the first place and to alleviate that burden in the body. My belief system is that if you eliminate all toxicity, and that is the key, all toxicity effectively, unfortunately that is strange to us as humans that we haven't identified how to effectively remove all toxicity. But if you can remove all toxicities, then you have a much better chance of actually achieving a positive outcome. You may be able to then move on to somebody's immune system in optimizing the physiology, but the key is detoxification.

Q: And explain to the Board, in general, why you use chelation with end-stage cancer patients?

A: Well, I don't use chelation for end-stage cancer patients any more than I use chelation for any other type of patient. I use it to remove a burden and it just happens that most of these patients with end-stage cancer have a tremendous
burden.

In fact, the physiology of cancer patients seems to be very similar to that physiology of an autistic patient which is the reason that I was asked by them to come and testify on that issue.

QAnd --

AAnd if I can add something that may make it clearer, it's an inability to get rid of the burden.

QAnd, again, when you're addressing end-stage cancer patients, what do you feel the role of nutritional therapies are?

AIt's vital. If you look at the cancer research, when you look at the epidemiological studies, it is quite evident that cancer or war against cancer that was declared by President Nixon in the late 1960s that we have miserably failed. We actually have a higher incidence of cancer and now cancer has become the new false death in the industrialized world.

And with all the modern technology, if you can go to the moon, it would seem logical that we should be able to figure out what's causing cancer.

It appears that on the cellular level that there is an extreme deficit of nutrients. When I say nutrients, I'm not talking about nutrient health, but cellular level
nutrients, things such as -- (inaudible) -- super oxide -- (inaudible) -- etcetera, etcetera. It seems to be the bottom co-factors that are necessary for these enzymatic reactions to act in a catalase form as they're supposed to be in a normal physiology. There seems to be a completed deficit on some of these patients. In fact, all cancer patients almost pathognomonically seem to have this micronutrient deficiency.

And what has been postulated which is something that I came with at the same time that a Greek physician had come up with, that I love trees and I noticed that the last thing that a tree does before it does, it goes into a rapid state of reparation, it pollinates.

And it seems like that's what happens in cancer that at the last part, right before that area of the body gets so nutriently devoid, it goes into a self-preservation mode and starts to self-replicate the suppression of apoptosis which is characteristic of cancer, it becomes rampant, the under controlled cellular reparation, the obvious glucose metabolism, the anaerobic -- the anaerobic metabolism, there are many different common characteristics of cancer.

There's very -- there many different types of cancer, but
there's -- there are common characteristics and they all seem to be a response, a compensatory response to a deficiency on some micronutrient level, some microcellular level.

QCould you explain to the Board what role you see for oxidative therapies with end-stage cancer patients?

AThere are many postulates and hypothesis for how these various types of oxidated therapies work. Unfortunately, there's no profit for the pharmaceutical companies to do research to further postulate and elaborate as to what the actual mechanisms are, but there are a number of things.

Dr. Ripoll mentioned and I can further that, not only is it a catalyst, but it's a ferocity. There are various enzymes within the cells that in healthy cells that allow the body to deal with any type of oxidated stress.

However, fungi, yeast, various types of candidiases I guess would be the proper medical term to use, virus, some bacteria, heterogenic cells basically cells that have already had suppression of apoptosis that have uncontrolled cell reparation. They're various types of cells that actually do not have that compensatory mechanism intact.

So when you introduce an oxidated agent, what happens is
you can think of it as a burst of fire that comes to the scene, healthy cells can protect themselves, they pull the fire retardant over their cell membranes, if you will, for a lack of a better explanation, but these other cells that are the yeast, the viral, the bacterial cells, these abnormal cells that are mutagenic cells, they don't have that compensatory reaction, so they actually get hit with this burst of oxidation. And we have seen sometimes, even within an hour of a person with say acute influenza what is a rapid change in their physical appearance and their ability to be functional. It is completely done by this oxidated burst and the healthy cells are able to compensate and the unhealthy or un-normal cells that shouldn't be there for them not to be able to -- (inaudible).

QAnd I guess the last class of therapies that I want you to discuss with the Medical Board is the therapies that would somehow influence or boost the immune system. AThere are various ways of doing that. There have actually been studies through using prayer to show that even prayer has actually increased the level of active killer cells, active killer cell activity -- (inaudible). But everything from oxidative therapy, we do whatever it
takes. We use oxidative therapies, we use various peptide analogs that's nutritional, whether it's oral, whether it's intravenous. We have used biofeedback. We have used meditation. We have used anything that I can possibly put my hands on to save my patient's life.

Q: And have you had empirical success with patients with cancer?
A: Almost all cancer -- almost all the patients that have come to me with cancer have failed conventional therapies and I would say that of all those patients that were all considered terminal, I probably have about 40 percent of them still alive today.

Q: And now is that a statistic that you advertise to patients?
A: Ma'am, I have not advertised in 11 years of practicing medicine. I started advertising last summer because we were moving to a new location and my recurrent complaint by my patients is that I didn't know you were here, Dr. Buttar. Why won't you tell the world. I've had patients that lived a quarter of a mile down the street from me that drove by my office for ten years that were referred to me by a doctor in California.

Q: And -- and I guess when I said advertising, you took it as advertising to the -- in the media. What I was wondering is, do you tell your patients -- do you give them any kind
of statistics of success?

A No, ma'am. I tell them that -- you know, to me it's anecdotal. Sometimes doctors will say, well, this is some anecdotal response and to me, you know, it's a little strange that we say that because to that patient it's 100 percent of their experience is not anecdotal.

But I also know that I can't rely upon what happened to one person to be indicative of what happens with another person. So when my patients ask me what is your success rate, I tell them that my success rate whether it's 1 out of 1,000 or 10 out of 1,000 or 100 out of 1,000 is really irrelevant to their situation because I cannot predict what's going to happen. All I can tell them is that I will do my best, but I can't predict anything.

Q Now, you heard Ms. Kenny testify yesterday, did you not?

A Yes, ma'am, I did.

Q You heard her say that she was in a meeting with you the first time that her husband went to see you; is that --

A Yes, ma'am.

Q -- correct?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q And you recall that she said that she heard you say that you have a 100 percent success rate with cancer patients?
AYes, ma'am, I did hear --

Q Did you ever say that to Jeff Kenny or any other patient?
A I've never said that to any human being in my life.

Q And, in fact, you believe that you've never met Stephanie Kenny before?
A I have never seen that lady. In fact, I didn't know who she was until she walked -- until she was asked to walk up here.

Q And we'll get to more about that later with your -- when we go through Patient C.

A Ma'am, may I make one comment?
Q Yes.
A In medicine, what I was taught that any time anybody said 100 percent, there's no such thing as always or never in medicine.

And I have told my patients and I've lectured on this and this has been publicly documented that I've told patients that if doctors say they've got 100 percent or even 90 percent or even 80 percent, they are a liar, you need to move away from them.

Q And is that just with regard to cancer or with regard to any kind of treatment for any kind of malady?
A Well, especially in the type of medicine I practice, I only
get treatment failures -- I only get patients that have failed everything.

I don't have patients that walk in and say, hey, I was thinking about doing this or that. I get patients that are coming there from all over the place. I have patients from other countries, 27 different countries.

We don't advertise it. They come because they've heard from word of mouth and they come because they've failed everything else.

So I can't tell them anything. If they've already failed, my chances are already less than 1 percent. But the fact that they get better, the only -- the only thing I contribute it to is that God has blessed me.

QNow, let's talk specifically about these patients that are the subject of the complaints --

AYes, ma'am.

Q-- Patient A.

AYes, ma'am.

QCould you just in general summarize for the Board your -- your analysis of Patient A's case?

AWell, Patient A was a 49-year-old. Do you want me to do my -- my synopsis of the case or --

QOh, I want you to tell the Board what you recall about Patient
A.

Patient A was an end-stage cervical cancer patient who presented to me in late July of 2006. She was diagnosed in 2003. She had a history of a radical hysterectomy and bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy and node dissection sometime in 2003. Late 2003, she had -- if I remember right, she had one or two out of 14 nodes that were positive.

By September of 2003, I believe she had completed about 25 or 27 some radiation therapies. And after completion of the radiation, the patient had regular checkups for the next few months or was scheduled for checkups every six months.

I don't believe she went a full six months because in April she began having some pain. In 2004, I believe it was, she started having some pain on her right side and she ended up seeing a family physician. They had some scans done, some CAT scans and an ultrasound done and they found that she actually had a recurrence with metastatic disease to her lung and her liver. Her hepatic metastasis I believe was not as extensive as her lung metastasis was.

She was referred to M.D. Anderson. She had chemotherapy
which included carboplatin treatments I believe she had it twice, it's all in the record. She completed her last treatment sometime in June of 2006. Was seen in July of 2006 again by M.D. Anderson who noted that her liver enzymes were beginning to become elevated and they told her that she had basically failed everything and they referred her to hospice.

Q: Could you turn to Exhibit 11 in our -- in our book please?
   A: Yes, ma'am.

Q: Is Exhibit 11 a medical note regarding Patient A as to her last visit at M.D. Anderson?
   A: Yes, ma'am, it is.

Q: And is that part of the medical records that you reviewed to -- to get that summary?
   A: Yes, ma'am, it is.

Q: And does that reflect that as of July 13th, 2006 she was being denied further treatment at M.D. Anderson?
   A: Yes, ma'am, it does.

Q: Following -- following her last visit to M.D. Anderson, did she then seek you out?
   A: Yes, ma'am, she did.

Q: Okay. And do you know if you saw her the first time she came to the office?
AI saw her, but I saw her -- I stepped into the room. I did not do the office visit myself because our computer program for scheduling had been down and I remember that there was a out-of-country patient there that they were leaving the next day, so I went ahead and saw that patient and Jane saw Patient A and then I stepped in and talked with her and her husband briefly.

Q: Do you -- first of all, the person you referred to as Jane, who -- who is that?
A: That's Jane Garcia, she's my nurse practitioner.

Q: All right. And how long has Ms. Garcia worked for you? We can turn to Exhibit 5 and that might refresh your recollection.
A: It's been years, I'm not sure, five maybe.

Q: Exhibit 5, ma'am?
A: Yes. Is Exhibit 5 the collaborative practice agreement between you and -- and Ms. Garcia?
A: Yes, ma'am, but I think I started her -- I think she started before this.

Q: Okay. The earliest date on that is 2003. Is that --

Q: Yeah.
A: Yeah, 2003 sounds right, about five years.
QOkay. And so -- so as of 2006 Ms. Garcia had been practicing with you for at least three or four years?
AYes. Yes, ma'am.
QOkay. And tell the Board about your working relationship with Ms. Garcia.
AWell, the joke is that I'm lucky she's not 20 years younger because I may be having an affair with her. That's how much time I spend with her.
I have a very, very good working relationship with Ms. Garcia. I interviewed -- I went through an extensive number of people before I found somebody that I trusted enough to take care of my patients with me to help me take care of my patients.
QAnd have you trained Ms. Garcia yourself?
AExtensively.
QAnd -- and describe the access Ms. Garcia has to you.
AWell, Ms. Garcia is -- has 24 hour access to me anywhere in the world at any time she needs.
Ms. Garcia also spends -- well, just this week the clinic closed at 5:30, she and I were in the clinic until about 8:45.
We spend a lot of time together going over various things.
We have set once a week, I guess you would call it
mini-rounds where we review charts, but that's just what
we have set aside time. Throughout the week, any time
she needs me for anything.
She has become a very trusted member of my staff. The
most trusted when it comes to clinical aspects. She is
anal retentive. She constantly second guesses herself
when she has shown to be very proficient and it's only
because she's that anal retentive. She's a fantastic
nurse practitioner and I would not -- I would not be --
(becomes emotional) -- I would not be able to do everything
that I need to do without Jane's help.
QDo you want a drink of water, Doctor?
AYes, ma'am.
QNow, let's -- let's go to Exhibit 6 in our -- in our book and
again there's been redaction to that, but I'll represent
to you that that is the set of consent forms that Patient
A signed.
AI'm not sure what you mean by redaction.
QOh. The personal -- the identifying information has been
removed --
AOh, I see.
Q-- for the privacy of Patient A, so her name is not on there,
so it's -- you can't say -- I have to tell you what it
is. That's the only way in this -- it can work in a public hearing setting.

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd Exhibit 6, I will represent to you is a set of consent forms that was signed by Patient A.

AYes, ma'am.

QThe first one is just an intake form with information on it. The second page is the Consent for Treatment.

AYes, ma'am.

QDo you recognize that Consent for Treatment?

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd is that Consent for Treatment used with the patients consistently in your office?

AWith every patient that comes into our office.

QOkay. And if the patient has any questions about the consent forms, are there people that they can ask about that?

AAbsolutely. When the patient -- yes, ma'am.

QAnd this Consent for Treatment signed by Patient A refers to -- to cancer, does it not?

ANo, ma'am. It refers to everything.

QOkay. Well, why don't you read it for the Board.

AI authorize the medical and nursing staff at Advance Concepts in Medicine and Dr. Buttar to perform diagnostic tests
and administer treatment plans for allergy, immune
disorders, nutritional disorders, cancer, autism and
public chronic medical conditions.
I fully recognize that the treatments I will receive may
include nutrient, herbal, oxidative, functional,
integrative, alternative, preventive and/or conventional
therapies.
I also understand that: 1) the safety and efficacy of many
such therapies has not been established with controlled
studies; 2) specifically no claim to cure cancer with these
therapies has been made to me; 3) Dr. Buttar will not be
providing hospitalized care or emergency care for me from
this clinic; and, 4) the therapies I receive will
compliment the care I receive from my primary care
physician and will not replace them.
QAnd tell -- tell the Board why you word your Consent for
Treatment that way.
ABecause, again, I come from six generations of attorneys and
my consent form that my father and my sister came up with
would have taken a couple of weeks to go through, so we
took the highlights and put this together.
And they told me that in our litigious society and
especially with the limelight that doctors like I am that
are successful in certain modalities of treatment where those other people may not be, it would be better for me to have a consent form such as this and we basically kind of condensed it down to this one before we treat them.

Q Well, and is this consent form consistent with the way you represent yourself to your patients?
AYes, ma'am. But there's another consent form before we start actual treatment. This is just before I ever see them or my nurse practitioner sees them. This is just before we even sit down to talk to them. And they're given this consent form, we sit down and talk with them and then they have to sign it afterwards.

Before we -- there's another consent form before treatment.

Q All right. And you're talking about the IV consent form?
AYes, ma'am.

Q Okay. The third page of Exhibit 6 is the Financial Policy.
AYes, ma'am.

Q And I think we've been over that and what it says. Is that presented to each patient before -- before treatment?
AYes, ma'am. And we have designated staff members that that is their responsibility and it has to be checked off by a second person to make sure that they have been -- had adequate explanation of this policy.
QNow, during the period of time that you treated Patient A, did you have -- and let's turn if we can to Exhibit 7 in the book.

During the period of time that you treated Patient A, did you have occasion to refer her to Dr. John Clements at Carolina Digestive Health Associates?

Absolutely.

QAnd tell the Board why you did that.

AWell, when she presented to me she -- it was obvious that nobody had addressed her issues of jaundice. We had -- she wasn't -- she didn't -- her course of progression made me feel that she may have some type of a biliary outlet obstruction and I wasn't sure what was going on. I called Dr. Clements and he was kind enough to get her in right away to see what was going on.

I don't -- he and I talked about possibly during a ERCP on her. I don't know whether he did, I can't remember. But basically there was no biliary obstruction that he could -- that he could see.

Okay. And just in general in treating your patients do you utilize other medical providers in treating your patients?

AIn all these patients you can see consultations with other doctors, oncologists and such.
Q And in what circumstances would you particularly refer to a patient to an outside doctor?

A When I need help getting -- supporting what we're doing for the patient.

Q Let's turn to Exhibit 8.

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Exhibit 8 is the pages of the expert review sheet that Dr. Peterson filled out for the Medical Board.

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Have you had an occasion to review that?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Now, I will tell you that -- I'm trying to see which order these are in. I think Patient A is the second review sheet in this sequence. I should have put them in correct order.

A But the 49-year-old female with cervical cancer.

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Do you see that one?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Okay. And what I'd like to do now is go to the second page of that expert review sheet.

A Yes, ma'am.

Q And ask you to address the comments that Dr. Peterson made with -- with regard to your care and treatment of this
patient. The first comment I'd like you to address is Dr. Peterson's opinion that your treatment was below the standard of practice or care. Can you give a reaction to that, please?

A I've never done anything standard in my life and I'm not going to practice a standard when it's -- to me, it's not standard. I have a patient that comes to me and they want me to help them and I'm going to do everything I possibly can to help them.

Below standard of practice. Well, that's his opinion. I chose to only do one thing and that's practice above the standard.

Q And -- and why do you believe you practiced above the standard with this patient?

A Well, because we had subjective and objective improvements through her short course of therapy.

Q Okay. What were some of those improvements?

A On -- do you want me to specifically give the dates and -- and --

Q Well, just tell us what the nature of the improvements are.

A Well, she had liver functions that were progressively increasing and we started her therapy and her liver functions came down between July 31st and August the 3rd
and she was able to sustain that improvement for about two weeks and then the liver functions started going back up.

She had -- she was anemic when she came to us and she had a consistent improvement in her hemoglobin and her hematocrit. In fact, her hematocrit was back up to normal within three weeks of therapy.

She was able to reduce her pain medication. In fact, eliminate her pain medication for about 12 days, 10 to 12 days, if I recall correctly.

Her nausea had improved. She was able to ambulate. She had a better sense of -- she had a better sense of balance and her ambulation improved.

She did start after about 12 to 14 days start showing the liver function increasing and was also followed by -- she became icteric and she was -- had mild jaundice and that's when I got Dr. Clements involved to see if there was any type of massive -- mass effect versus a direct obstruction of her biliary tree.

QOkay. Now, Dr. Peterson's next comment is that he states the patient chart does not follow the problem oriented medical record methods of SOAP. So can you give your reaction to that, please.
Well, I'm not sure which charts he was looking at because I can give you the specific dates in the chart, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, at least eight entries where the SOAP note was used.

I use a SOAP note the same way learned how to use it at M.D. Anderson. We don't label the plan as a plan, we use -- we label it as AP, assessment plan, and where the assessments only go through where you write it as an impression. So we have subject, objective, impression and assessment of the plan, but that's -- that's how I learned it in my training and it's the same way that everybody else uses it, but it's right there in the chart.

And turn if you will to Exhibit 9.

Yes, ma'am.

And I'll represent to you that those are the progress notes and treatment plan for Patient A.

Yes, ma'am.

Now, the first two pages are the initial note; is that right?

Yes, ma'am. This is her first time.

Okay. And who took the history?

Jane did.

Okay. And did you review that?

Yes, ma'am.
Q: And are the notes that were made mostly made by Jane in here?
A: In this whole chart or just --
Q: In this -- in this section.
A: In these two sheets?
Q: Yes.
A: Yes. Jane -- Jane made these notes.
Q: Okay. And did you then review and countersign them?
A: I reviewed the notes with her the same day actually, that's when I stepped in with the patient.
Q: Okay. And then as the treatment progressed, did you continually review the notes that were made?
A: The ones that I wasn't in there with her, I reviewed and co-signed; otherwise I did the notes myself or I did review them myself or whatever.
Q: Okay. And does the chart show your co-signature on that?
A: Yes, ma'am, after the slash.
Q: And let's go back to Dr. Peterson's comments. His next comment is the standard of care was to refer -- to refer this patient for hospice -- to hospice for palliation. Could you give your reaction to that?
A: She was already referred to hospice. I'm not -- she came to me from hospice, so I'm not sure why I would send a patient that came from hospice back to hospice if she was already
referred to hospice.

Q Okay. And what did you note -- and I'll turn your attention
to the progress notes. What did you note about this
patient's desires to go to hospice as opposed to continuing
treatment with you?

A In -- well, I know that the family was very adamant. I know
that they were -- they had already done their homework.
They had already checked out certain things and
unfortunately sometimes the things that they were relying
on may not be as reliable, but they had a lot of information.
They were well versed.

They knew that they were out of options on the conventional
side. I asked them if they had talked with their
oncologist -- (inaudible) -- providing clinical trials
and they said that they had no -- they had no other options
and that that's why they came to us.

Q And what did you --

A I'm sorry --

Q What did you observe yourself about this patient's desires
as far as -- herself as far as continuing treatment?

A Well, I remember that when it became clear to us that she was
failing our supportive therapies and her immune system
was not responding or if it was responding, it was a little
too late because she was already in multi-organ system failure. I had -- she was actually in the IV suite, she was getting an IV and I asked Robin my nurse -- and the only reason I know it's Robin is because when you work at the office and you find out who it was because I couldn't remember who it was.

When one of my nursing staff members went to get her from the IV suite to bring her into the exam room, she refused. She did not want to come to the exam room. And I was in the exam room, the daughter was in the exam room and I asked Robin, what's going on.

And Robin said, Dr. Buttar, she doesn't want to come in here.

And Marie, her daughter, went out and came back in in tears and she said, Dr. Buttar, she doesn't want to come in here because she thinks that you're going to stop her treatment and she cannot handle that. She will not stop treatment.

And then I had this discussion that's documented on August 14th with her daughter at that time.

Q And is that documented in Exhibit 9 at page C7?

AC7A, yes, ma'am.

QC7A?
AYes, ma'am.

QOkay. And, again, whose writing is that?

AIt's mine, ma'am.

QOkay. And what did you document at that time?

ADo you want me to read the note?

QSure.

AI discussed with daughter the issue of evaluation with Dr. Clements showing no external biliary obstruction, deteriorating LFT, with increasing alkaline phos. and bilirubin indication of progression of tumor and increasing need of narcotics to control pain, further indication of progression of disease. However, hemoglobin and hematocrit actually improving. Daughter states mom wishes to continue treatment and the daughter nor myself wish to take hope away from that patient -- from the patient. Daughter states her mother is adamant about continuing treatment. Abdominal ultrasound, enumerable hepatic lesions consistent with extensive metastatic disease with no extra biliary obstruction. And I've got her lab values documented there and what we were going to continue doing.

QOkay. And in this patient what was the influence as far as --
In this patient why did you continue treatment?

Well, one was because I have -- I'll try to be succinct with this, but I'll --
as -- well, let me withdraw that and try to restate it another way.

Well, I've taken a lot of fire in service to my country to ensure freedom and I do not see why that freedom that I have potentially given my life for that I come back home and that my patients don't have that freedom to make a choice they want or I don't have the freedom to try to help them if I think that I can possibly help them.

QAnd at this point, had you given up hope?

Well, I never give up hope, but I could see the writing on the wall. At this point, her detoxification and her immune colligation was not the issue. She was already in organ failure. And unfortunately once you're in organ failure, there's nothing that could be done because now you've got the organs that necessary to up regulate if you want to detox by somebody they've already failed, so there's no way to get rid of the toxicity.

Just to make sure, I mean, I called Dr. -- one of the oncologists that I work with who is in my opinion probably --
the leading oncologist in the country and talked with him
too and discussed the case. I don't know whether it's
documented in here or not, but I did. I remember talking
to him.

QTurn to the next page.

AYes, ma'am.

QPage 70.

AYes, ma'am.

QWhat does that document?

AThat's discussed with Dr. Holbert in details -- in detail.

And basically I was --

QAnd who is Dr. Holbert, just --

AHe's a hematologist oncologist and he -- as I understand it,

he's got board certified in nine specialties, but I'm not

sure if that is correct.

QAnd so you called to discuss this patient with Dr. Holbert?

AYes, ma'am, I did.

QAnd -- and based on your discussion with Dr. Holbert, did you

believe you could still continue the -- there was some

chance you could help him?

ADr. Holbert and I were of the same conclusion. He said you're

doing everything you can for Patient A and keep on going.

QOkay.
AI mean, basically he told me that, you know, if she's already been turned away by everybody else, what are you going to do, dump her in the street. That was pretty much the words that he used.

QOkay. And -- and, again, this note, the 15th of August was how long between that note and death at this point? I believe the patient was -- it was -- it was the same week, I believe.

QThe last criticism by Dr. Peterson on this patient is no physician contact documented. We just looked at a note that you wrote. Did you have physician contact with this patient?

AI had -- I made notes based on the chart. I don't know where they are here, but I know the dates that I saw the patient.

QOkay.

AI saw the patient on July 26th. I performed an intra-respiratory reflex on the patient. I'm the only who does that, so there was no way the patient could have received that treatment without having contact with me and the note is in the chart.

On August the 3rd, I performed IRRs on the patient. She was having problems with breathing and she had a documented improvement after the IRRs within about 25 seconds to a
minute, it's in the chart.

On August the 14th, I had a long visit with the patient.

On August the 15th, I did IRRs on the patient. In addition, at least three separate detailed conversations with the patient and the daughter regarding the whole prognosis while Jane was in the office dictating while I was talking to the patient.

And pretty much with all my cancer patients I see them every day they're in the office. I just don't make a note perhaps, but I stop by and talk to them, see how they're doing, how they're appetite is. I may check for edema.

It's not a hard and fast rule because I may be tied up with other patients, but I see them virtually every day.

We only charge for an office visit when I sit down for an hour with them or an hour and a half, but, you know, five minutes, ten minutes, there's no -- there's no charge for it and sometimes it's not documented.

Q: Now, let's turn if we -- if we can to Patient B and I want to go back to Dr. Peterson's criticisms of your treatment of Patient B in Exhibit 8. That would be the next expert review worksheet starting with a 51-year-old, metastatic
ovarian cancer. Do you see that?

A Yes, yes. Wait a second. Did you say it was the third one?

MR. KNOX: Yeah, the third one.

Q Yeah, third one right after Patient A.

A Yes, ma'am.

Q First of all before we address Dr. Peterson's comments, could you give us an overview of your treatment of Patient B?

A Yes, ma'am. She was 51-year-old white female who presented April 29th. She was in Stage IV ovarian cancer referred to us by her primary care physician. Her initial diagnosis was in August of 2002 of having carcinoma of the ovary with staging done in 2002 and she was staged at 3C at that time. She went for a suboptimal bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy of the tumor could also be done. The patient's history included a total abdominal hysterectomy in July with the ovaries that had been left, but that was later resected.

After the diagnosis with the ovarian cancer she underwent chemotherapy with carboplatin and Taxol and until about April 2003. Her CA 125 continued to rise. I went from 202 up to 715. The CAT scan showed persistent mixed radio dense masses on the bladder.

By June of 2003, cancer markers had risen to 1292. They
changed her chemo and changed her to weekly doses. I can't remember what the chemo was.

In August of '03, repeat CAT scans revealed that she now had lesions in her liver.

By September, chemotherapy was again changed. This time was to Doxil. All in all, she had 16 months of chemotherapy before she presented to us.

Q And what was your treatment plan with this patient?

A One of the things about this lady that I remember, she was -- she was a very sweet lady. But she had -- she basically was referred to hospice when she came -- well, she was referred to hospice when she came to us, but she hadn't had any conventional treatments since December of the preceding year, so she hadn't had any treatments for about five months before coming to us.

And one of the things I wanted to do was get a CA 125 on her and her last CA 125 had been around 5,000. And she said, well, I had one done in December.

And I said, well, we need to do another one and she didn't want to do it because she didn't believe in -- one of my experiences is when patients have failed everything, they don't believe in anything that the doctor says.

So I just told her, I cannot do anything with you until
I get a baseline to see where CA 125 is. And we -- we obtained that before we initiated any treatment with her.

Q Okay. And before you initiated any treatment, what was her CA 125?

A Well, she came to us on April 29th, we -- I'm sorry, yes, I believe that was right, yes. We did a CA 125 on her which was done on -- CA 125 was done April the 15th. Actually, I guess she came to us before then, but we didn't start any treatments. The CA 125 was done, 10,000 -- it was 10,000 -- 10,028.1.

Q Okay. Turn if you will if this will help you to Exhibit 14.

A Yes, ma'am.

Q Turn if you and this will help you, to Exhibit 14.

A Yes, ma'am.

Q I will represent to you that Exhibit 14 are the blood work done for cancer work -- and I guess his brother --

A Yes, ma'am.

Q -- just was a patient.

A Yes, ma'am.

Q And is there a chart in here that measures the progression as far as her CA 125?

A I believe there was one that she did herself or her -- her boyfriend did. It was -- it was referred to the letter,
it really wasn't a letter, but it was somewhere in here, I believe.

Q It's the last page.
A Yes, ma'am, the last page.

Q G27?
A Yes, ma'am.

Q And is that the chart that they presented to you --
A Yes, ma'am.

Q -- with her progression on C 125 --
A Yes, ma'am. We just --

Q -- CA 125?
A Yes, ma'am. We just put it in the chart.

Q And then is it also noted on that chart her -- her measures during treatment with you?
A Yes, ma'am.

Q What does it show?
A It was 10,028 and after -- well, it's important to note that she really didn't initiate IV therapies until sometime in May and she was -- she was under -- she only had IV treatments for about three and a half weeks. And on June 11th which was her last, I believe -- well, that was when we got the next CA 125, the CA 125 was down 6,219.

Q Okay. And with regard to your treatment of this patient, turn
if you will to Exhibit -- Exhibit 12.

AYes, ma'am.

QAre these the same consent forms that we looked at earlier with regard to Patient A?

AThere's -- yes, ma'am. They're slightly different because at that time the -- I mean, the wording is the same, it's just on the same piece of paper, the intake form instead of the other side.

QOkay. And were these -- these consent forms, as far as Patient B, signed to your knowledge?

AYes, ma'am, they were.

QOkay.

AIt's checked before we do any kind of treatment.

QAnd with regard -- turn if you will to Exhibit 13.

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd I'll represent to you that Exhibit 13 is a set of progress note to this patient?

AIt's --

QOkay.

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd who saw the patient when she first came?

ABoth of us did.

QBoth of us who?
AJane Garcia and myself. Jane Sprite.
QOkay. And -- and who -- who co-signed the note?
AIt's mine.
QOkay. And did you -- you yourself meet with this patient?
AYeah. I was telling Jane what we were going to do. I'm talking to the patient and Jane was just writing everything down.
QOkay. And then a physical exam was performed on this patient on May 11th?
AYes, ma'am. Before we start IV treatments, we have to do our own exam.
QAnd who performed the physical exam?
AI did.
QOkay.
AI mean, we do an exam all the time, but this is a form -- (inaudible) -- through the exam.
QOkay. And are there more notes by you on the 11th of May?
AYes, ma'am.
QOkay. Summarize if you will the course of this patient with your clinic.
AYou mean, how many times I saw her?
QWell, not necessarily how many times you saw her, but what happened during the course of treatment.
AWell, each time I would visit with her or we do the IRRs, she
was obviously responding to treatment, but the problem was that she was very non-compliant.

She was under the impression that if she came for the IVs, which she was very religious about doing, that she would get better and that's simply not the case. It's just one part of the treatment.

And so I kept on telling her she had to do -- she had to watch what she was eating. She would come in with those crackers and cheese that you pick up at gas stations that are laden with all sorts of preservatives and half the stuff is all synthetic and she was still putting that stuff in her body.

She wasn't doing the liver packs which -- and the coffee enemas that are necessary to help pull some of these body burdens and as an stringent she wasn't doing that stuff. She wasn't -- she just overall wasn't doing what she was supposed to do.

She was under the impression that if she just did the IVs that she was going to get better.

QAnd as a result of her non-compliance, what -- what decision was made with regard to her further treatment by your practice?

AI told her that if she wasn't willing to do what was necessary
to get better, I was not going to watch her die.

Q And -- and --

A I gave her the choice to see if she was going to change and she didn't and I had a conversation with Jane and then we had a conversation and we felt that it was best to discharge the patient from our practice.

Q And -- and was that accomplished?

A That was accomplished and it was -- she was referred back to her primary care physician.

Q Now, with regard to -- going back to Exhibit 8 and the pages of Exhibit 8 that deal with this patient, can you tell us your response to Dr. Peterson's criticisms of your practice? The first one being she was treated by Dr. Buttar with alternative therapies without success.

A Well, he thinks that a drop of 4,000 in CA 125 after three weeks and three days of IVs is no success, then I guess he's entitled to his opinion.

Q What about --

A I fought the -- (inaudible) -- part of it is -- for his freedom of choice as well, so.

Q Okay. And his -- his assessment that your care was below the standard of practice?

A Well, Ms. Godfrey, I think you know what they say about
opinions, everybody has one.

Q Okay. What about his reference to your failure to use SOAP notes?

AWell, it's documented. I'm not sure what he means by that because each one of these charts has SOAP notes. It was -- if a person knows how to read English, then he can read the SOAP notes, but I don't know what -- how to comment. He obviously didn't read the notes -- or I'm not sure.

Q Another comment by Dr. Peterson is like the three prior patients, there's no evidence that Dr. Buttar or any physician at his clinic ever interviewed or examined Patient B.

AI've got my own exam in there. I've got notes in there. I can tell you exactly which days I saw her, what dates they were performed, it's all documented in the chart. The Medical Board has had this information since sometime in 2006.

Q Dr. Peterson also stated she was treated with alternative therapies consisting of vitamins.

AYes, ma'am, she had --

Q She had vitamins, IRR injections --

AYes, ma'am.

Q-- all unproven. This is clearly not the standard of care.
What is your opinion of that statement?

A He's right, it's not the standard of care, it's beyond the standard of care.

Q And do you -- do you believe your therapies had the ability to help this patient?

A I believe that any therapy that eliminates a burden, a toxic burden in the body, is going to help the patient. It's already been established now in the field of quantum physics where the quantum coherence field is being interrupted by some type of signal. And essentially what I'm trying to do is achieve zero point. Zero point being defined as maximal output with minimal expenditure.

To me, the human body is the most perfect piece of machinery because it's the only piece of machinery that I know of, the more you use it, the better it gets, but there's some reason that it's starts to deteriorate.

And the reason it's deteriorating is because of the level of toxicity that we are being exposed to on a constant level.

So any therapy that is going to remove that burden, whatever that burden is, will have a substantial improvement at helping the person's system. And if their system is up-regulated and their immune system is up-regulated, and
their detox, then obviously the patient is going to do better.

QDo you -- do you feel like during the time you treated this patient you had a good relationship with her. Well, what was the nature of your relationship with this patient?

AShe was a very sweet lady. I formed an attachment to her.

I knew that she was going to not do well because she just wasn't listening. She wasn't becoming compliant.

And her fiance was very supportive and actually was probably an instrumental part of her support system that tried to help encourage her, but he even told me that she just -- when she goes home, she doesn't do what you're asking her to do.

QNow, during the course of her treatment with you, did you receive a gift from Patient B and her fiance?

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd I can't part with this because we only have one copy of it, but could you -- could you tell the Board what this is? And it's designated as Exhibit 15.

AIt's --

QBut I couldn't get a copy of it.

AShe was an antique collector and she had gone out and tried to find an antique for me which I thought was very sweet.
It was -- it's a medical dictionary that's over 100 years old.

Q Okay. And did she or -- or her fiance, I'm not sure which, inscribe something in that?

AYes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. For Dr. Buttar from Alex and XXXXXX (Patient B), May 17th, 2004.

Q And that was received by Patient B -- or -- okay, never mind that. Withdraw that question.

AShe gave it to me, yes, ma'am.

Q She gave it to you. I'll get it right.

AYes, ma'am.

Q When Patient B left your care, was there a balance owing?

AI don't really know. I don't deal with that part of the practice, ma'am. I think there may have been, I'm not really sure.

Q Okay. Do you know -- well, do you know if your practice ever collected from her estate?

AI know that there was -- I don't know whether she had a balance then. I don't know what the details were, but I know that nothing was pursued.

I didn't know when she passed on. She had been given -- I believe she had been given just a couple of months to live, but she lived five -- five months or maybe six months.
And when she passed on, when she transitioned, there was no further effort from my staff because they know that if something like that happens, you know, we send a card. And that's what we did, we sent a card. I don't know what else Libby does or --

QOkay. Now, with regard to Patient C --

AYes, ma'am.

Q-- could you describe your -- your overview of Patient C for us?

AIs it a he?

QYes.

AYeah, okay. I thought you said she, I'm sorry.

QIt's a he.

APatient -- the last patient we just discussed and this patient we're about to discuss, I've actually presented these as case studies in a couple of different conferences.

Patient C and I -- Patient C and my entire staff developed a very close relationship and I think that's just because of a function of time that he spent with us.

He was a patient with adrenal carcinoma initially diagnosed in 2003. Status post a cervical resection that was done in October with a left-sided nephrectomy, adrenalectomy
and splenectomy. He had extensive lymph node dissection done and he presented to me with a 59 pound weight loss after having had -- well, he presented with a 59 pound weight loss after his radiation therapy.

He had a history of a prior diagnosis of cancer. He had abdominal surgery done in October of 2002 with resection of his lower -- excuse me, of his sigmoid colon with greater than 4 centimeters removed. He had a colostomy and then a few months later had a colostomy take-down done.

Subsequent to that, he underwent 16 treatments of radiation and he was advised to have, I think, twice that many or close to that, I think 30 treatments or so, but he only underwent 16, maybe 18 because he couldn't tolerate it and he was becoming very sick and that's the period that he had that weight loss.

He was told by his oncologist that chemotherapy would not be an option and was reported to have less than six months to live. His 2004 -- February 13th, 2004 post-operative scan showed questionable lesions in multiple sites including new -- new lesions in the liver, lesions in the lungs.

He presented with Stage IV adrenal cancer to us in February of 2004.
QOkay. And what regimen did you prescribe for this patient?

A The regimen that I prescribed was the same thing as the -- you know, detoxifying his system that each one of the patients -- if there's one particular toxicity that we see that is different from somebody else's, then we deal with that on a different level.

But our fundamental approach is to reduce the -- reduce the heavy metal burden, to stimulate the immune system, to improve the nutritional components and get the weight back for this patient.

This particular patient's weight was a big issue because he was tachypneic and he was -- he was very close to -- he was very close to demise when he came to us.

Q Now, Exhibit 17 is a set of consent forms. Again, are -- and I'll represent to you that they were for Patient C.

There's a third page to Exhibit 17 which is consent for chelation therapy.

AI'm sorry, ma'am, which -- where --

Q Exhibit 17.

AYes, ma'am.

Q Look at the third page.

AYes, ma'am.

QOkay. Do you recognize that consent form?
That is an outdated consent form. We -- it's been updated since then, but, yes, this was the consent form at that time that we used.

Okay. And it was -- and this I'll represent to you was signed by Patient C and was found in your chart.

Yes, ma'am.

What are you informing them about there about chelation therapy?

Basically, that -- by the prevailing standard of the double-blind placebo-control that -- do you want me to just read it or -- I mean, I --

Well --

I'm just basically telling them that there's no guarantee. This is what we observed. It's based upon guidelines from a couple of different national organizations, the American College for Advancement in Medicine, the American Board of Clinical Metal Toxicology, the American -- the Institute of Preventative Medicine and there's a number of other -- this is the same information that actually when I helped with the TACT trial, the same information that we used for consent for in the TACT trial.

The TAC trial, what's that?

A trial to assess chelation therapies, a $30 million dollar
grant for that and I was an investigator for that -- for
that trial.

Q: Okay. Now, specifically, that chelation therapy, I think
there were some concerns from the Board Members as to
possible dangers or bad effects from that. Can you explain
to the Board how you do chelation therapy and how you try
to prevent or monitor the patients so that they don't have
adverse effects from it?

A: Yes, ma'am. EDTA, that means ethylenediaminetetraacetic
acid. EDTA is one-third as toxic as over-the-counter
aspirin. The problem with the chelator is not that the
chelator is dangerous.
The definition of chelator is that whatever goes into the
body must come out intact. The only difference is, that's
it's bound to -- to a metal ion.
The issue of safety comes in with how a physician is going
to administer this. For instance, a rapid IV bolus would
be dangerous because it's going to defy the -- (inaudible)
-- equation, it's going to cause a rapid physiological
shift that is not warranted.
But a slow, steady infusion of the -- whatever the chemical
is, whatever the chelator is, in this particular case we
use diamine sulfuronic or diaminetetraacetic acid. If
done in the right way, it's completely safe.

In fact, the issue that has been brought up and the few documentation -- excuse me, the few documented issues that have occurred has had nothing to do with the chelator, but rather the effect that the chelator had on the heavy metal burden.

So what happens is that when you put in a chelator into the body, the chelator is going to bind to metals. If you put in a large dose of a chelator, initially it's going to bind to more metals. As it comes through the vacuoles of the renal parenchyma, the vacuoles can't handle the burden of metals.

One -- one issue is that the -- there's been studies that have been shown on post -- on post-mortem biopsies of a patient's renal parenchyma showing a greater propensity of metals in the renal parenchyma. Actually, the American College of Cardiology published data that was done in Italy showing the patients that died of -- (inaudible) -- dilated cardiomyopathy had over 20 -- excuse me, yeah, over 22,000 times a safe level of mercury within the myocardia compared to other tissues in the body. So there are certain tissues that are more prone to becoming susceptible and to becoming vectors if you will of holding these metals.
So in the renal parenchyma issue of the safety issue, what happens is one of the chelators going through the body and it's actually hitting the kidneys, the kidneys are used to seeing one part of mercury per million parts of urine, for instance, normally.

But EDTA would be used for lead, so let's use lead as an example. The kidneys would normally be seeing one part of lead per million parts urine. Now you're giving a chelator, so all of a sudden the kidneys are seeing 500 parts of lead per million parts of urine.

That's a 50,000 percent increase in the load that the kidneys are used to seeing and load is what's going to cause an issue with the patient if the renal parenchyma can't handle -- if the -- (inaudible) -- filtration can't handle the load.

Now, if done judiciously, there's absolutely no problem.

And we have infused well over 200,000 intravenous therapies in my office since 1997 when I opened my office, so the last 11 years. I have never yet seen a single complication. It just doesn't happen if the doctor knows what they're doing.

It's like saying that -- it's like saying that a car is good because it's a mode of transportation and a gun is
bad because it hurts people. But that car, if you put
an alcoholic behind it, is going to kill somebody and that
gun becomes very useful if somebody is breaking into your
house.
So the issue is not the tool, but rather the user that's
using the tool. If the physician is not competent, then
of course you're going to have a problem. Just like with
any medication if not given appropriately, you can have
a problem.

Q: Do you -- are there certain labs you need to monitor when people
   are on --

A: Absolutely.

Q: -- people are on chelation?

A: Absolutely.

Q: And what labs are those?

A: The most common ones -- one thing is always go for a very low
dose challenging agent the first time because I don't know
whether they will be an excreter or non-excreter and maybe
we'll get into that, but that's -- that's a phenomena that's
very crucial to this.

But if a person is an excreter, they're going to dump metals
right away. This is -- this is depending on -- you know,
what do I mean by excreter or non-excreter and I'll try
to summarize what I told the U.S. Congress.

But essentially some patients have a genetic predisposition for the inability to detoxify. They may have a methatechrohydrocholic (phonetic) enzyme deficiency. They may have a glutathione S transfer issue. They may have a CUMT lesion. They may have some type of polymorphism. The gamuts out there, it's just -- they may have a methylation issue.

Whatever the case is, they're having a problem eliminating certain types of chemicals or substances out of their body that other people seem to be able to do without much problem or they're reducing -- they're eliminating less than what other people can -- can eliminate.

So what we have to do, is we have to first determine is this person going to be dumping metals readily or are they holding on to them.

For instance, the biochemistry of an autistic patient or a cancer patient seems to be a physiology that has an inability to excrete. So with those patients, we can be more aggressive because we know that they can't dump that stuff.

But with other people, you don't want to induce too much metal, so you have to go slow. You have to give them a
low dose and that's what we start with every patient just to see what the first load is.

When you're doing that, you have to monitor renal function, that's the first thing, looking at BUN and creatinine and we do that. We have a standing order that every patient that's getting -- going through IV treatments, they must have a BUN and creatinine on record as well as a chemistry panel, baseline as well as every five treatments.

If they have any history of renal impairment, we will actually then increase their frequency to every three weeks or two weeks.

I've even had patients that have had a kidney transplant that we've done this with and they've been phenomenal with the results, but we monitor that patient every week because we want to make sure that we don't want to have any kind of complication from that aspect.

We also do specific gravity urine. We also look at the heavy metal burden with the post-challenge test.

Initially before we start any type of treatment with IVs, we also get our routine things such as 12 lead EKG.

We do -- bone mass has been a big issue, some -- some non-educated criticisms of chelation therapy has been that it'll pull the calcium out of your bones which is absolutely
an untruth.

In fact, Rudolph and Madonna in Missouri have shown in a study that there was an increase of 32 percent of bone mass density in one year after a person underwent chelation therapy. And I can explain that if the Board wants me to explain it, but it's based upon parathyrodone (phonetic) and calcitonin balance. If you want me to, I can go into that.

But basically there's other tests that we do that we monitor, but basically the kidney function, the LFTs and urine specific gravity and then we do heavy metal challenges every 20 treatments to see what the burden is, whether it's going up or coming down. If it's going up, that means you are a non-excreter. If it's coming down, then obviously they're dumping the metals.

And there's other things that we do depending on what we have the patient -- you know, whether she's a patient to have.

QOkay. Thank you, Doctor. Turn if you will Exhibit 20.

AYes, ma'am.

QIs this documentation taken from this -- from -- I'll represent to you -- we'll do it that way. Is this documentation taken from Patient C's conventional medical treatment
records with regard to his treatment by his oncologist.

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd I think the second page of -- of Exhibit 20, L15 is the CAT scan that was -- that was done in February of '04.

AYes, ma'am. That was done I think like -- if I remember right, that was just done shortly after -- within a couple of months afterwards.

QAfter what?

AAfter this diagnosis that he was given with no recurrence of disease.

QRight.

ARight.

QRight. And then at that time though there was a recurrence?

AYes, ma'am. He was -- he had nodules that were found in the lung, in the liver. He also had retroperitoneal adenopathy and there was some issue of left pelvic bone involvement, two small benign -- the two small benign presenting left pelvic bone -- as I mentioned are benign.

QOkay. Let's turn back if we can to Exhibit 19.

AYes, ma'am.

QTell the Board, if you will, what that is with regard to Patient C.

AThis test?
Q: Yes.

A: This is a fundamental test that is crucial for my being able to follow a patient in seeing whether they're responding to my therapy or not.

Q: And what -- what -- what do those lab tests measure?

A: Natural Killer Cell Activity. There have been multiple studies done to show that in patients with cancer or even AIDS or any other type of significant immunosuppressant -- immunosuppression, excuse me, that the Natural Killer Cell Activities are significantly reduced.

In fact, the comment made by Dr. John Wilson is a completely true statement that if the immune system was intact, there's no way that cancer could manifest. The problem is if the immune system has had some type of burden that has compromised it and allowed for the cancer to become rampant.

Everybody, from the day they're born, we have cancer cells in our body and I'm sure the Board is aware of this. We have cells that are constantly going into -- into uncontrolled cellular proliferation and our body hasn't met apoptosis that basically allows us to have normal cells to commit suicide so that it doesn't affect the whole.

This is a normal thing.
Natural Killer Cell Activity and some of these other things that -- that are part of this, the -- (inaudible) -- response is actually showing how well their immune system is functioning and how well or how normal their cellular physiology is and that's what it's coming down to.

Q: And specifically with regard to Patient C --
A: Yes, ma'am.

Q: When Dr. Peterson says that your treatment was below the standard of care, do you have any reaction to that with regard to the lab tests that we're looking at right now?
A: As far as remaining calm, there are three times we did the tests on this particular patient because he went through treatment more for well treatment than the other two because they only went through a short period of treatment.

But when he came to us, his Natural Killer Cell Activity was 8.6 milliunits.

Q: And I don't mean to interrupt you, but just for the benefit of the Board, are you looking at a chart that is the last page of Exhibit 19?
A: Yes, ma'am. This is -- this is a sheet that I have that we put on all our patients so that we can document what we're doing so we can start seeing what the pattern is with our
cancer patients that are coming to us. We're obviously trying to -- most often in addressing this issue is one, immune modulation; and, two, detoxification for the toxic burden, we try to keep a concise method of documenting this information so that I can go back and refer to it quickly and see how they're developing. This is one of those sheets.

Q: And what does that sheet show with regard to Patient C?

A: The normal reference rate for lytic units for Natural Killer Cell levels is 20 to 50 lytic units. And when the patient presented to us, it was 8.6 lytic units with the Natural Killer Cell Activity per cell of 5.3.

So that I can perhaps explain this a little bit better. Natural Killer Cell Activity would be how strong your army is. Natural Killer Cell Activity per cell would be how functional each individual soldier is. So if you have a high Natural Killer Cell level, but you have a low Natural Killer Cell Activity per cell, that would mean that you're Natural Killer levels are there, but the soldiers are apathetic and they're not really doing what they're supposed to be doing.

Versus if you have a Natural Killer Cell Activity that's say low, that means your army is small, but your Natural
Killer Cell Activity per cell being high would mean that each one of your soldiers is like a supersize soldier.

So a 5.1 would be -- on the Natural Killer Cell Activity per cell -- 5.1 would be the bare minimum for Natural Killer Cell to be considered functional and 10 would be the high end of normal.

When the patient came to us, his Natural Killer Cell Activity per cell was down to 5.3.

And I can look through the rest of it if that's what you want me to do or --

QOkay. Well, what significance is this to you as far as the efficacy of the treatments?

AWell, by the -- by the third time we did the test and actually this is the last one, right? One of the last ones we did which was in May, we had increased his Natural Killer Cell Activity to 20.8 bringing him into the normal range and we had taken his Natural Killer Cell Activity per cell and from his previous test which was the middle test, more than -- more than doubled that, so he was at 7.9.

His -- I can tell you all the specifics here. There were a number of things that were pertinent in this. His Natural Killer Cell Activity in 2.5 months went up 150
percent. Natural Killer Cell Activity went up more than -- more than 100 percent. His NKHT3 plus cells -- we did that with competency -- and there's different levels of competency of these Natural Killer Cells. The NKHT3 plus immunocompetency cells increased from 15 percent to 19 percent.

His lymphocytes increased from 6400 to 10,400, so his counts -- they were -- they were still normal, but they were increased without giving way to demargination or -- (inaudible) -- like with infection or anything, but it's basically is an indirect measurement that his immune system was becoming more palliative.

His CD2 counts went up from 863 to 1,005. His CD3 increased from 849 to 1,034. His T helper cells CD4 went from 446 to 612. His CDHT, the suppressors cells went from 381 to 393. His CD19 and CD20 which are the B cells which are the ones that basically do the -- create the antibodies where the body went from 141 to 233. His CD15 and 56 went up from 163 to 262. His dipeptidal pepsase increased from 337 to 597. His cell cycle improved significantly before treatment and after treatment as is documented with the results. That's -- QSo --
That's what that showed.

So do you believe that the results show a positive impact from your treatments?

This person was told at this point that he could take a break from treatment and I was more concerned about another issue that was going on with him, but his immune system was coming up. I mean, I couldn't have asked for a better profile.

Okay. And when you told him you wanted to take a break from treatment, what was his reaction?

He had a friend also -- I mean, renal cancer is very rare -- but he had a friend also that had renal cancer and they had both planned in seeking treatment and his friend had gone to Europe to a place that I had actually suggested to Patient C also that I thought was a good place and his friend died at that time. And his friend's disease wasn't as extensive as his -- as Patient C's was and so he felt -- I think he was scared and he felt that he needed to continue.

And so did he continue then and for how long -- how many weeks of treatment?

Well, I wanted him -- I wanted him to get out of this environment because there was another issue going on with him and I was pushing him to take a vacation, but he continued treatment and then followed up with my recommendation.
sometime in June.

Q Okay. And in June did he take a break from your treatment?
A Well, he -- it wasn't that I wanted him to take a break from my treatment, I wanted him to get out of his environment and I wanted him to find a place that he could continue getting maintenance.

Q Why did you want him to get out of his environment?
A The most potent form of oxidative stress is stress which would mean that the most potent form of antioxidant therapy may be prayer, he was very stressed. He was under a tremendous amount of duress.

This man, when he was done with his treatments would not go home, he would stay in the clinic and sometimes wait until the last employee would leave.

On two separate occasions I walked into the exam room and there was screaming inside the exam room and I would walk in with some concern and he would turn to me and apologize and shut his phone.

There was just -- this was a very, very sweet man. He was in the process of writing a book and creating a website to tell the world about what he was experiencing and how he was improving with our treatment, but he was under a lot of stress.
And my concern so much at that time was -- it was obvious his immune system was coming up. We had been debulking him from his toxic load and he was responding very well to treatment, but his face you can see he was -- he wasn't -- I mean, he was gaining weight and his color was good, but you could see stress. You could seen the frown on his -- on his -- I mean, between his eyes. He was just stressed and he just did not want to go home.

And even when I told him that he was ready to stop treatment and just go on a maintenance program he said, no, I'm not ready. And he said, I like -- I like being here. And I said, this is a clinic. I mean, go to the park or, you know, go watch a movie or do something with your kids and he was actually doing things with his kids, but he just didn't want to go home. And --

QAnd so did a plan arise for him to leave the country?

AYes. I had actually discussed with him going to Dr. Tony Menez in Mexico who is a colleague of mine who's an oncologist who uses the same therapies that I do. And Dr. Menez basically couldn't take him because Dr. Menez was leaving on a missionary trip to South Africa. But Dr. Menez used to work at the Issles Clinic, I don't know how to pronounce that, but he recommended that that may be where Mr. XXXXX,
excuse me, where Patient C would perhaps want to go. And that happened to be the same place that he had looked at before, so he was very agreeable with that.

Q Getting back to Dr. Peterson's criticisms and if you could just briefly react to EDTA chelation therapy has no benefit in treating cancer and bear in mind we have -- you discussed extensively why you believe it is.

AI wasn't treating this cancer with EDTA therapy.

Q What were you treating with EDTA therapy?

AI was treating his -- his metal load which is in here somewhere. I'm not sure --

Q It's not in that notebook, I think. No, it's in the patient regular notebook.

ACan I use it a minute?

QSure.

AIs it this one? I mean, I was treating his metal load is what I was treating, but, I mean, I can tell you the metals, but I don't remember offhand.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I would like to see that.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. Is it the big one?

MS. GODFREY: Yeah, the big one.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You can go ahead.

WITNESS: I'm sorry, ma'am.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: You can go ahead if there's another question.

MS. GODFREY: Okay. What I was going to try to do is just give him Patient C's chart. How about -- yeah, it would be easier to do with this.

MR. KNOX: I'll tell you what --

MS. GODFREY: No, we can find out --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I would like to see that.

WITNESS: I'll be able to find it faster.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

WITNESS: Are all the labs together?

Okay. I was treating him for a burden, an elevated burden of mercury and lead, as well as elevated levels of arsenic and tin. Because he had been diagnosed with cancer, he was, by my definition, a non-excreter so his metal levels were -- I mean, he had the inability to excrete, but yet he was still excreting elevated levels. He had documented levels of arsenic, antimony, cadmium, lead, mercury, nickel, thallium, thorium, tin and tungsten, but the ones that were elevated were mercury and nickel. As far as I'm concerned, any level in the body of these substances is not safe, but the ones that were considered elevated were mercury, nickel and arsenic.
Q: Dr. Buttar, those results are from a urine test -- urine challenge test; is that fair?

A: Yes, ma'am, they are.

Q: And what lab performed that?

A: This particular one is performed by [REDACTED] which is a Medicare provider, certified with the American Board of Pathology approved laboratory.

Q: Okay. Do you own any interest in that lab?

A: I wish I did.

Q: Okay. But you don't?

A: No, ma'am, I do not.

Q: Okay.

A: And just as a side note, this urinary testing that Dr. Peterson said was bogus is done by Quest Diagnostics, it's done by LabCorp, is done by Nichols Laboratory which is all -- all the big research that's done is done through Nichols. The Center for Disease Control uses it. In both my visits to the Center for Disease Control they do urine as well as blood, fecal and they actually -- the most accurate method is actually biopsy samples, but as Dr. Wilson mentioned, that's not conducive to the practice of medicine by doing multiple site biopsies. That's someone difficult to get a patient to consent to and obviously I'm being
a little facetious. But toenail clipping levels of mercury, that's been shown in multiple studies.

In fact, the New England Journal of Medicine reported a study where they showed a direct correlation of mercury levels and myocardia infarction and -- (inaudible) -- organic acid.

But there are many labs that do this. Great Plains Laboratory, Geneva Labs, right here in North Carolina, there's numerous labs that do urinary metal profiles. Metametrics does this and they're all government -- and they are all Medicaid certified laboratories.

QOkay. With regard to Dr. Peterson's other criticisms, he says that the labs that you've drawn have no clinical relevance such as urine toxic which you've just discussed.

ASteatocrit.

QSteatocrit.

AThat has nothing to do with metals. That's looking at the gastrointestinal system which a lot of these patients have problems that resulted in digestion of the nutrients in their -- you know, they think that it's normal to have a bowel movement every four days which is ridiculous and we have been able to establish a balance there.
QOkay. And so you believe those labs are necessary. What about labs?

AYeah, these are just -- he just pulled like some lab -- he just pulled some levels out of this complete diagnostic urinalysis that we do, but, yes, they're all -- they're all pertinent. I mean, if they're normal that's great, but many times they are not normal so we have to help the body get into a state of balance.

QNow, he says that the standard of care would be to treat with chemotherapy such as -- (inaudible) -- or enrollment in a clinical trial versus palliative -- (inaudible).

AI think that he's mistaken because from what I understand it -- again, I'm not an oncologist, I don't know. I refer this to an oncologist. But I believe that chemo was not an option for him.

QAnd --

AHe had adrenal cancer which I think even -- I'm not sure, but I don't believe adrenal cancer is usually responsive, but I could be wrong, but --

QAnd, finally, if you'll turn to Exhibit 18 which is your -- which is your progress notes for this patient, can you respond to Dr. Peterson's criticism that no physician contact was documented?
On June -- I'm sorry, excuse me, on February 16th, I conducted an exam myself and wrote a detailed note, a progress note, SOAP note.

On March 24th, I conducted an exam and wrote a detailed note.

On April 7th, I conducted an exam and wrote a detailed note.

On April 7th, I also had a second -- a second note in there.

On May 4th, I conducted an exam and did a note.

On May 25th, I examined the patient and wrote a note.

On June 9th, I did a progress note.

On March 15th, I performed IRRs on the patient.

On March 23rd, I performed IRRs on this patient.

On March 30th, I performed IRRs on this patient.

On April 6th, I performed IRRs on this treatment -- on this patient, excuse me.

On April 14th, I performed IRRs on this patient.

On April 20th, I performed IRRs to treat the patient.

On April 27th, I performed IRRs on this patient.

On April 28th, I performed IRRs on this patient.

On May 4th, I performed IRRs on this patient.

On May 11th, I performed IRRs on this patient.

On May the 18th, I performed IRRs on this patient.
On May 25th, I performed IRRs on this patient.

On June 1st, I performed IRRs on this patient.

And on June 9th, I performed IRRs on this patient and it's all documented in the chart.

And that does not include my post signatures and any notes that was done by anybody else.

Q And the IRRs were, again, to relieve what?

A Well, Dr. Wilson gave a great history of IRRs, but what I have found it actually -- because the patients that have cancer, they are in a greater state of -- (inaudible) -- metabolism.

And most of these patients are in respiratory distress and you document that a respiratory reserve is noted on pulse oximetry before and after treatment and there is an immediate, sometimes less than 30 second improvement in ventilation of these patients with -- with an improvement in respiratory reserve that sometimes exceeds 200 percent with a pulse oximetry that generally goes up anywhere from 3 to 5 percentage points.

And these patients -- I mean, this is -- these patients literally want to get up and give you a hug and thank you.

I've seen patients with tears in their eyes because they can all of a sudden breathe better.
So I'm actually just trying to improve oxygenation. That's the reason I do hyperbaric, to improve oxygenation in these patients because cancer is anaerobic metabolite. It is an -- (inaudible) -- anaerobic metabolite, so my goal is to increase that anaerobic metabolism in the system thereby using oxygen as beneficial. First year of medical school we're taught that the -- in fact, I'm an ACLS instructor, ATLS instructor, I'm a PALS instructor and I've kept up with all these certifications as an instructor to continue to teach for the last 15 years.

And the first line of drug -- in ACLS -- the first line of drug -- this is a question you always ask people, what is the first line of drugs. The answer is oxygen. So we use oxygen to help increase the airway state of the body.

Q And in your observation of Patient C, did he -- did he object -- physically get better under your care? AI mean, it's documented throughout the note that his ambulation increased. I mean, the guy when he came had a hard time walking and was able to start walking, he was able to start playing the drums again. He was a drummer. He ended up selling his business and started working on
these web sites. He was a programmer. In fact, on one specific occasion he had a gentleman that met him at the office while in his treatments to discuss doing some projects for this gentleman. He was able to start going to his kids' games.

He -- on one occasion when I asked him what he was still doing in the clinic -- it was like 5:30 and he was still there and his treatment had finished at 3:00. I had a talk with him because I thought he wasn't feeling well. He said, no, I feel great, I was just waiting for my kids' game to start and I'm going to meet him there.

And I said, why don't you just go home and he didn't respond, but he hugged me and thanked me and said, just the fact that I can go to my kids' games is something that I'll never -- never forget. And so that -- that was something that I remember because it's something that's just hard to forget.

QOkay. With regard to Patient C's conventional course, after he returned from Mexico there is a note and it's Exhibit 21 that is a note from his oncologist. And I believe the date on that is August 10, 2004.

AAugust -- yes, ma'am.

QAnd was he under your care or was Patient C under your care
at that point?

AI didn't see Patient C after June. I know that he was still in touch with the office and there was, you know, communication, but I didn't see him coming in for -- as -- I didn't see him come in to see me as, you know, no office visit or anything, so in August I did not see him. At least if I did, there was no note, but I don't -- because there would be a note.

QOkay.

AI think the last time he was seen in our office was before he left for Mexico.

QOkay. And as of August of 2004, he was beginning to have some edema in his distal extremities, is that correct?

AYes, ma'am, he did.

QAnd I think the -- he's also having problems talking.

AYes, ma'am. He -- he had some problems with breathing early on in his treatment course with us and that's one of the reasons that I did a little bit more IRRs than I normally would because he had such a benefit.

But before he left for Mexico there was nothing abnormal about his breathing. I mean, it was, you know, consistently responding to treatment and he was actually -- we were proud of that -- he was -- the duration of how
much he felt improvement would last longer. Sometimes -- the initial time, it may only last, you know, a day or so, but he was seeing longer residual.

QAnd as of -- as of August, does the note say that he's still receiving immune therapy from Mexico?

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd what's the recommendation of the oncologist with regard to that?

AContinue it.

QOkay.

AThis -- this patient's biggest issue was that he was under a lot of emotional and psychological duress.

QAnd then did you become aware that Patient C passed away?

AI did.

QAnd are you aware of the -- of -- I think we have his death certificate, if I'm not mistaken.

AYes, ma'am.

QIf we could look for that. Exhibit 33, if you'll turn to that.

AYes, ma'am.

QIs that a -- I'll represent to you that's a death certificate for Patient C.

AYes, ma'am.

QWhat are the listed causes of death?
Atherosclerotic heart disease, adrenal cell carcinoma and pulmonary emboli.

QOkay.

AAs I understand it, he presented with a pulmonary -- his symptomatology was acute pulmonary emboli.

QOkay. With regard to Patient D, I'm going to cover her with your -- with your nurse practitioner, Ms. Garcia in --

AYes, ma'am.

Q-- in detail. But you never saw Patient D; is that correct?

AI did not examine Patient D or see her.

QAnd is that a normal occurrence in your practice for a patient that presents with -- with metal toxicity issues?

AAbsolutely. It's -- I mean, she was not a compromised patient. She had -- I mean, it was a very clear cut case. It would be like -- it's a very basic thing and Jane is more than qualified to handle something that was, you know, like that or even -- I mean, it was just -- I see the charts like I see all the patient's charts and I, you know, co-signed the notes and there was no issue when we went through -- I mean, I covered it in a regular weekly meetings that we have.

QOkay. And so you were aware and monitoring this patient's treatment?
Absolutely and everything was fine.

Okay. In response to a question by Mr. Jimison in your deposition, were you asked to gather information about your office costs for providing certain IV treatments?

Yes, ma'am.

And did you gather that information from your accounting records and from your accountant?

It was a tremendous burden, but, yes, we did, ma'am.

Okay. And turn, if you will, to Exhibit 26.

Yes, ma'am.

And, Dr. Buttar, is this a document that you yourself produced?

No, ma'am.

Okay. How was it produced?

Well, I helped format it because I do a lot of stuff in Excel, so I helped them format it because they couldn't get it in the right format. But it was done between my accountant and my financial officer in my office.

Okay. And what -- what was the purpose of -- of collecting this information?

I believe Mr. Jimison was saying that I was charging outrageous fees or something to that extent.

Okay. And did he just ask you to provide cost information for five of your IV treatments that you do?
Actually, he asked for four. I must have misunderstood him because I've provided five. But I believe he only asked -- because I don't think he asked for five but I put that in there, but I must have misunderstood him.

QOkay. And are all these IV treatments that were provided to the patients in this case?

AThese particular five, all those patients got -- (inaudible) -- I mean, everybody gets different depending on what their issue is, but for instance -- (inaudible) -- we would not do it, if somebody had a liver issue or something like that. But these five all -- all the patients in question -- well, A through C, not D.

QOkay. And what does this show with regard to your -- well, first of all, I know we're looking at a period of time here from -- I think the first patient was in '04 and the last patient might have been in '06.

AYes, ma'am.

QWhat does this show with regard to how much money you were collecting for IV and can you explain that first as opposed to charging per IV?

AWell, we collect -- it was $115 per IV, we collected in March 2005. That was a question that was brought up sometime. I don't know if there's an adjustment on these patients'
charts. We were collecting $115 per IV from 2000 to 2005.

From 2005 to 2007 our overhead had increased and we started charging -- I'm sorry, excuse me, we started increasing what we were collecting $125 and after June 2007, we started collecting $135.

QAnd does this then show -- for example, the first IV is EDTA, does it show all of your costs in providing that IV to the patient?

AYes, ma'am.

QOverhead, what does that include?

AIncludes everything from nursing staff, administrative staff, rent, electric, malpractice, CME, dealing with investigations of the Medical Board and costs of all these different things. I mean, it's just -- it's everything that it costs me to have my clinic functional so I can see patients.

QAnd then the other things listed there, are they direct -- what are they?

AThose are the direct hard costs of what it costs us to do any of these particular IVs. That's -- the way our accountant has that, that's under cost of goods sold and the rest of it is under overhead which is all the other things.
Q: And so are you able then to calculate what kind of profit you're making on the IVs that you're giving?

A: Well, they were able to calculate, yes, ma'am.

Q: Okay. And is that shown in this exhibit?

A: It is.

Q: For -- for which IVs?

A: For EDTA currently -- do you want me to read these?

Q: Well, you can. Currently for EDTA, what kind of profit are you making?

A: $1.78.

Q: Per IV?

A: Per IV.

Q: And how long does it take to provide EDTA IV to a patient?

A: It depends on the patient and what dose they're getting. It's usually giving one gram per hour, so their full dose of treatment, it will take two and a half to three hours. If it's an initial dose, .75 grams will take about 45 minutes.

Q: And the next one is DMP -- DMPS.

A: Yes, ma'am.

Q: And what kind of profit are you currently making on a DMPS IV?

A: $7.68.
QAnd, again, is that -- how long does it take to administer one of those?

ADMPS is actually done over 20, 25 minute IV drip.

QGlutathione?

AGlutathione?

QThion, sorry.

AYes, ma'am. $2.83.

QAnd how long does it take to administer one of those?

AThat can be done at a number of various methods. It can actually be done over a five-minute push, it could be done over an hour drip and it all depends on the status of the patients and what other things they are getting and also whether they've been, you know, there's other issues that we look at, but could be done, you know, a five-minute IV push which the nurse is there the whole time for the five-minute push or a drip over an hour and a half or so.

QOkay. And --

AIt's also depending upon dose.

QThe next one is hydrogen peroxide.

AYes, ma'am.

QAnd how much are you currently making off of hydrogen peroxide IV?

A$7.22.
QAnd how long does it take to administer one of those?
AHydrogen peroxide, about an hour and a half. Since we've been
doing ozone, we don't do much hydrogen peroxide now, but
when we do that, that's an hour and a half maybe.
QOkay. And a vitamin C IV?
AVitamin C IV again, if it's 25 grams versus 100 grams it
all depends how -- how much we're doing. We start the
patient actually at 35 grams, they go up to 50 and they
go 75. By the third IV they're at 75 and then I usually
keep them there or we'll take them higher.
QOkay. And how long does it take to administer a vitamin C
IV?
AGain, it's based on the -- (inaudible) -- and based upon the
problems with the patient, but it can take up to two hours.
QAnd the profit per IV you're currently making on vitamin C?
AI think this is actually wrong because it's -- each vial --
it's $9.41, but we don't charge anything more for your
treatment.
QOkay. Now, lastly, I'd like you to turn to Exhibit Number
27 and tell the Board what that is.
AThat's a sign that's in our front and it's also something that
we have -- we used to have it in the front office in my
old office. In the new office, it's just at the check-out
place and it's framed, setting up so all patients could see it when they're leaving when they pay.

Q And is that something that you did -- well, why did you post that sign?
A Because the Medical Board wanted to make sure that my patients knew that this was being done for profit the last time when they investigated me, whatever you want to call it.

Q And -- and is that why the sign is then posted in your office?
A Yes. Actually, this was -- this was -- this isn't actually the -- this says, last revised January 18th, but it was revised again after 2003, but this was actually -- I think after the second visit in -- maybe the first visit in 1999 that the Medical Board had and we put this up. And then in 2003, this last revised obviously isn't -- isn't right because in 2003, we put this notice posted for all patients in order to be fully compliant with the policies of the North Carolina Medical Board.

Q And did you play a role in the legislative effort of the North Carolina Society for Integrative Medicine --
A Yes, ma'am.

Q -- lobbying the Legislature for a change in the Medical Board statutes?
A Yes, ma'am, I was.
Q: Explain to the Board Members what role you played in that?

I'm the president of the North Carolina Integrative Medical Society. We felt that integrative doctors were being singled out for the practice of medicine. We testified in front of the House. Our bill was 886, Due Process for Physicians -- for all physicians, not just integrative physicians, but every physician.

The House was 78 percent against us, 22 percent for us. And after my testimony the vote went 116 to 6 in our favor.

It was presented to the Senate and it went 40 to 7 in our favor. 40 Senators voted for us, 7 against us. Of the 7 that voted against us, they represented all the doctors that were on the Medical Board of Dentists.

And it was interesting because it didn't make any sense why a doctor would be opposed to a bill called Due Process for Physicians. There were extensive meetings between Mr. Mansfield and myself and Mr. Henderson and the past president of the Medical Society, Dr. Kanof at the legislature. There were press releases done.

We -- we changed the law, actually, from what I understand the fastest law that's ever been changed in North Carolina.

And I was still under the impression that -- that the Medical Board is doing the best that they can and I'm not
so sure any more.

MS. GODFREY: I don't have anything further.

MR. JIMISON: I don't know if the Board wants to break for lunch.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: How long is your cross-exam going to take?

MR. JIMISON: Twenty to thirty minutes and I can't guarantee, but I think it would be about twenty, thirty minutes.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Let's go ahead and take a break because some of the Board Members are indicating they need to take a break. So we'll -- we'll just go ahead and do lunch and then -- can you be back by 12:50? Does that not --

MS. GODFREY: 12:50?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- give you enough time?

MS. GODFREY: That's -- that's fine.

(11:58 A.M. - 12:55 A.M. RECESS)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. We'll go ahead and proceed then.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You can have a seat, thank you, sir.

WITNESS: Okay.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, I think that it's your time
to cross-examine.

MR. JIMISON: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

Q Dr. Buttar, let's start off with some things that I think we
can agree on. You have no medical training of oncology,
correct?

A Other than what I did in my year in a residency, no, sir.

Q But you're not -- you didn't do a residency solely devoted
to oncology --

A I did not.

Q -- or cancer?

A No, I did not.

Q You're not board certified in oncology?

A No.

Q You're not an oncology surgeon?

A No.

Q You're not a radiation oncologist?

A No.

Q Also, as to Patients A, B and C, but I think we can agree on
this, they all came to your office with metastatic cancers,
correct?

A They came to me all with end-stage metastatic cancer, yes,
that's correct.

Q And for each of these Patients A, B and C you -- you treated them with essentially with similar therapies, correct?

A Well, it's interesting that you brought this up because my -- my goal of therapy is to debulk them and debulk them from their toxic load to stimulate their immune system. And the techniques that I have at my disposal with that I have so far learned are the same techniques whether -- no matter what it is, whether it's a person's toxic and they've got cardiovascular disease or cancer, I'm using the same treatment to debulk the toxic load.

Q I mean, we can agree that they all got hydrogen peroxide therapies?

A Yes, they did.

Q And we can agree that they all got ozone therapies?

A In these three cases, I believe that's correct.

Q We can all agree that they all got some form of chelation?

A In these three patients, that's correct.

Q And we can agree that all of them got vitamin C?

A In these three patients, that's correct.

Q And they all got assorted minerals and vitamins?

A That is correct.

Q They all got IRR injections?
AThese three patients, yes, they did.

QAnd they all got vitamin C?

AI believe in these three patients, yes, they did.

QOkay. And -- and everything I just listed from the hydrogen peroxide down to vitam C -- what about the glutathione, did they all get glutathione?

AI would have to look back at the chart, but I'm quite certain they all three got glutathione, yes.

QAnd maybe some got hyperbaric chambers, but not all got hyperbaric chambers but they could have got hyperbaric chambers down in South Florida?

AThat's correct, if I had it they would have definitely gotten it, yes.

QIf you had it. Now, each one of those things I mentioned, hydrogen peroxide, ozone, chelation, vitamin C, minerals, IRR, biofeedback, glutathione, hyperbaric chambers, none of those things have been shown to work for cancer in any clinical trial, correct?

AThere have been clinical trials that have been done on various modalities of treatment. If you're asking me in the United States, I'm not aware of anything that combines all those treatments together.

QSo Dr. Peterson would not have been incorrect saying that none
of these therapies are within prevailing treatment for
cancer, correct?

AWell, if you look at the individual IVs for instance at the
University of Kansas right now they're conducting trials
of vitamin C.
The trials that Dr. Peterson was talking about versus what
we're talking about, Dr. Peterson is talking about, those
trials are to determine safety because you're giving a
toxic substance. These treatments are not toxic, so
there's nothing to determine as far as Phase I which is
usually to determine toxicity and safety. There is no
issue with toxicity or safety with any of these treatments.

QBut I'm just trying to stay on what we can agree with and I'm
just trying to get -- you can answer yes or no and then
explaining the answer and you can --

MR. KNOX: Objection. He says -- may I just speak. He
doesn't have to answer yes or no.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: He can explain his answer.

MR. JIMISON: If it's possible. I'm just trying to see
if there's areas of agreement.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No. Go ahead.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) These hydrogen peroxide, ozone and
chelation, vitamin C, minerals, IRR, glutathione,
hyperbaric chambers, those are not within the prevailing and acceptable medical practices for the treatment of cancer in this country, is it?

AThat is incorrect.

QWhy is that incorrect?

AThe American Cancer Centers right now or Cancer Centers of American use these modalities in their seven different hospitals throughout the United States that are using many of these modalities.

QFor cancer?

AYes, for cancer, that's why it's called the American Centers for -- I just said it, Cancer Centers for America. They're advertising all the time on TV. They use this in conjunction with other therapies, conventional therapies such as chemo, radiation, but they are giving these treatments that we just mentioned, yes.

QWhen Patient C went to -- I'm sorry, Patient A. When Patient A went to M.D. Anderson which is a pretty progressive cancer center and you said you even got some training there.

AYes, absolutely.

QThey spoke about getting oxygen therapy after they basically said there's nothing more that we can do for you here,
correct?

That's correct.

And -- and the doctor there said, well, there's not any legitimate clinical trials at all of these therapies being offered at M.D. Anderson, correct?

Dr. Garth Nicholson from M.D. Anderson has sent me patients, so I'm not sure what you're -- if that doctor didn't know, he didn't know. Is that what you're asking me?

Yeah. Mainly I'm just saying, is that a fair statement on his notes?

From that note, yes, you're correct, that's what he said.

And so M.D. Anderson according to this doctor with his knowledge of what was going on there, they weren't doing oxygen therapies?

That's correct.

And you're familiar with the American Cancer Society, correct?

Absolutely.

And they've recommended that oxygen therapy not be given to patients, correct, with cancer?

I am not aware of that.

If you can turn to the thin notebook.

MS. GODFREY: Which notebook?

MR. JIMISON: The thin one, the Board's thin notebook.
MS. GODFREY: What exhibit?

MR. JIMISON: Number 19.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) I'm going to read you something at the bottom of that from -- from Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center.

A What page, I'm sorry?

Q The first page.

A Yes.

Q The last sentence says: the American Cancer Society urges cancer patients not to seek treatment with hydrogen peroxide, ozone therapy or other hyperoxygenation therapies. Oxygen therapies should not be recommended.

A You know, if you're going to ask me to make a statement --

Q That statement -- line right above it, it says: because of the blood-borne viruses such as hepatitis C and HIV reported after treatment with contaminated autohemotherapy devices.

A That's exactly what it says here. And obviously with any treatment that you do with contaminated autohemotherapy device, you are going to have a risk, so I would -- I would agree with the statement.

Q Well, I read that statement correctly, correct?

A You only read part of that statement. You took it out of
context.

QOkay, here at 21.

AI'm sorry, which page?

QThe first page.

ADoes it have page 22 on it? The first page is 19.


AOh, sorry. Okay.

QAnd this is from the American Cancer Society.

AI do not believe it is.

Qwww.cancer.org?

AThat is not the American Cancer Society to the best of my knowledge.

QOkay. Well, let me just read the statement at the top under Overview from this document. It says: Available scientific evidence does not support claims that putting oxygen-releasing chemicals into a person's body, as described here, is effective in treating cancer.

MS. GODFREY: Well, unless the source can be identified, we're going to object to it being read into the record.

AYou could have read this -- I have no idea what it --

MR. KNOX: Wait a minute, Doctor. Wait until she gets through.

MS. GODFREY: Again, my objection is, Dr. Rhyne, that
unless the source can be identified and I believe under the Rules of Evidence in order to cross-examine somebody with a journal article you have to show first that they rely on that particular journal or publication and I don't think that foundation has been laid by Mr. Jimison's question.

MR. JIMISON: Actually, this may be a good point. I want to go fast, but I do want to make this point of law and I've got so many documents. I know the Board Members have the Motion in Limine, if you all could turn to that and --

MS. GODFREY: The Motion in Limine?

MR. JIMISON: Yeah, the Motion in Limine.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We've got a lot.

MS. GODFREY: If you can move that up.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: This is the one I think, Ms. Godfrey --

MS. GODFREY: That I filed, yeah. And it has the rules of -- the hearsay exceptions attached. It's 803-18.

MR. JIMISON: It says: To the extent called upon to the attention of an expert witness upon cross-examination or relied upon by direct examination statements contained in published treatises, periodicals or pamphlets on the subject of history, medicine or other science of law are all established as reliable authority by the testimony
or admission of the witness or by other expert testimony
or by judicial notice -- meaning that you folks can take
judicial notice -- If admitted, the statements may be read
into evidence, but not received as exhibits.
So all we're doing is reading it into evidence. You can
take judicial notice of it, if you like. It's not
contingent upon the witness. There's three different ways
that it can be done. The witness can verify it, another
expert witness can verify it, or you this Medical Board
can take judicial notice of it.

MS. GODFREY: Well, unless the source is identified, how
can they take judicial --

MR. JIMISON: Well --

MS. GODFREY: -- notice of it?

MR. JIMISON: I'll identify the source by the -- by the
URL.

DR. McCULLOCH: Are we talking about Exhibit 19?

MR. JIMISON: Exhibit 21.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No, I think you're talking about 21.

DR. McCULLOCH: He's talking about 21, I'm sorry.

MR. JIMISON: And that is from the -- at least at the bottom
of the -- the bottom is from www.cancer.org?

MS. GODFREY: Right.
WITNESS: Ma'am, I'd like to make a comment on this document, if possible.

MR. KNOX: Wait until --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead. Go ahead, sir.

WITNESS: The reference at the back of this document, one of the references is an organization that is called -- and this is on page 4, ma'am -- it is the, two, three, four, five, six, seventh reference down is an organization called quackwatch.org. They've already been found to have their references and their information that's been -- and presented in the courts of California and Wisconsin to be biased and unreliable. And so anything with a reference to that organization to me is fraudulent.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) Are you familiar -- are you familiar with www.cancer.org as the American Cancer Society web site?

A No, I am not. The American Cancer Society's web site that I'm aware of is ACS.org.

Q Well, are you familiar with Duke or the UNC programs?

A I am.

Q Do they have integrative programs?

A They do.

Q Do any of those programs use oxygenation therapy for cancer?

A No. They send those patients to me.
Q: Do you refer patients to Duke?
A: Yes, I have.

Q: On the integrative programs?
A: Actually, not only for the integrative programs. I'm not sure if it's with the integrative program or not, but I have had patients sent to me from Duke.

Q: For oxygen therapy?
A: Yes.

Q: And who are those oncologists?
A: They're not oncologists. I didn't say they were oncologists.

Q: Who will send you the patients then?
A: I would have to go back and pull those charts to find out the names of those doctors, but there have been two different doctors that have sent me patients from Duke.

Q: So I'm talking about -- you say you didn't know whether it was from the integrative medicine program?
A: I do not.

Q: So you don't have any knowledge that the integrative medicine program at Duke has ever sent you patients?
A: You asked me if Duke has sent me patients. The answer is yes.

Q: What I meant was that integrative program?
A: I'm not familiar whether any of those doctors had a position in the integrative department. The integrative
department doesn't have exclusive appointees. They usually serve on some -- in some specific division and they also have a physician on the integrative faculty. They have an interest in it from what I understand.

Q And isn't it true that their curriculum does not include -- does not include teaching oxidation therapy?

A I'm sorry, I'm not familiar with the curriculum.

Q What about UNC, do you know of their curriculum?

A I've lectured. I've been invited to come and lecture at UNC Chapel Hill. I've had their medical students rotate through my office, but I'm not familiar with their curriculum.

Q Are -- or have they -- do they teach oxidation therapy --

A Like I said, I'm not familiar with their curriculum.

Q You testified on direct examination that you've never done anything standard in your life, correct?

A Well, my goal has always been to be above the standard. I'm sure I failed sometimes and hit the standard.

Q So what is the standard for end-stage cancer as you understand it?

A I think that, Mr. Jimison -- and I'm not sure if I understand this question -- but I think every person is going to have a different definition of what their standard is. My
standard is can I look at the patient in the eye and can I look at myself in the mirror and that's what my standard is. If I can't, then I've done something short of doing the best that I can for my patient.

Q: Okay. You heard Dr. McCulloch ask a question earlier about the National -- I think it was the NCCAM. Are you familiar with that organization?

A: The National Council of Complimentary and Alternative Medicine. I'm not sure who Dr. McCall is. Oh, I'm sorry, Dr. McCulloch, that's right. I'm sorry. Sorry.

WITNESS: My apology, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: It's not a problem.

Q (By Mr. Jimison): Have they taken the position on oxygen therapy, if you know?

A: I had actually met with -- I met with the National Council for Complimentary and Alternative Medicine when the previous of -- HHS, he had set up an appointment for me to go meet and they actually -- during our meeting there was a discussion on what types of things that they are -- what type of therapies and what type of treatments they openly promote.

And the assistant head of NCCAM at that time said that this is a very politically volatile time and they have
to be very conscious of which ways to make inroads. And anything that would be construed as being more than controversial, they would have to keep on the lower priority and use those types of modalities that have been more widely accepted to promote and get inroads with integrative medicine and complimentary and alternative medicine.

QSo they do not promote oxygen therapy?

AI am not familiar with what they do and do not promote because I do not use them as a reference, but that was what I was told during my last meeting at NCCAM.

QNow, we go -- let's go to Patient C's record.

APatient C?

AUh-huh (yes). Well, let me ask a question this way, are there other doctors in North Carolina practicing oxygen therapy for cancer patients by itself?

AI use oxygen therapy -- the correct name is oxidative therapies -- for various number of issues in the patient's body and those patients may present with symptoms of other diseases. They may have cardiovascular disease, they may have cancer. There are doctors that are using oxidative therapies in North Carolina besides myself, yes. For what purpose, I am uncertain.
QOkay. And so -- but to your knowledge you're the only one using it for patients with end-stage cancer?

AI'm not using it with patients with end-stage cancer. I'm using it to debulk their bodies. It just so happens that patients come to me that have end-stage cancer.

QOkay. So when Patient A, B and C presented to you, they didn't present to you for looking for you to help their cancer?

AThey came to me because they wanted to live.

QDid they look to you -- were they presenting because they wanted you to help them get rid of their cancer?

AThey came to me because they wanted to live. My patient, the one that you saw testify, I asked her did she have an issue, if she has cancer for the 50 years if she is still alive and she said no. But cancer is not what I'm going after.

QAre you familiar with the document Innovative Protocols for Treating Chronic Disease, Cancer, Cardiovascular and Neurodegenerative Disease?

AYes, I am.

QOkay. Just wanted to flip through it and see if that is familiar to you.

AYes, it is. It was an ACCME approved course that I give.

QOkay. Turn to page -- I believe it's --

MS. GODFREY: Do you have a copy of that for us?
MR. JIMISON: I don't, but I'll ask him if this is just a fair statement of his own materials.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Who -- who made this up?

A Some marketing people.

Q But you read over it and approve it, correct?

A I think that my operations manager or somebody must have reviewed it. I've reviewed it, but probably not, you know, in a very detailed manner. I mean, I've gone through the content that's pertinent to the course, but the marketing stuff, I'm -- I really don't really look at it. I know there's nothing they are claiming from what I know.

Q Is this a page with your sort of information? Could you read the first sentence?

MS. GODFREY: Well, Marcus, can -- can we just see that because you haven't --

MR. JIMISON: Yeah, well, before he reads it, you can show it to your counsel, if you want.

A Yes, that -- that line said --

MR. KNOX: Did you hear what he said?

WITNESS: I'm sorry, sir, I did not.

MR. KNOX: Well, hand it over to me before --

WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry, excuse me.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Can you make copies --
MR. JIMISON: Yeah. I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- for us, also? Thank you.

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry.

MS. GODFREY: Yeah, we just wanted to see that exhibit, if that's okay.

WITNESS: Want me to give that back to you or --

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Well, if you could read the first sentence of the second paragraph.

ADr. Buttar practices in Charlotte, North Carolina where he's the Medical Director of Advanced Concepts in Medicine, a clinic specializing in the treatment of cancer, heart disease and other conditions -- chronic conditions in patients who have tried conventional treatments with a special emphasis on the relationship between metal toxicity and insidious disease process.

QOkay. So it says your clinic specializes in cancer, correct?

AAgain, Mr. Jimison, I will try to be as succinct as I can, but the World Health Organization in 1998 and 1999 stated that 8 out of 10 people in the industrialized world die of either cardiovascular disease or cancer. When you add neurodegenerative disease to it, it's 92 percent. It is 92 percent of causes of all death which means homicide, suicide, all natural disasters, wars, all chronic disease
together 8 out of 10 people are dying of heart disease and cancer.

So the reason that says chronic disease, cancer, cardiovascular disease and neurodegenerative disease is because it represents 92 percent of causes of all death.

Q If you can turn to your -- the thin notebook that I think you might have in front of you.

A This one?

Q Uh-huh (yes). To your deposition which is 12, I believe.

A 12, yes, sir.

Q If you can turn to page -- I believe it's 51.

A Page 51. Is that the -- is that the first number at the bottom or was it the -- I have the pages.

Q No, I'm sorry, do see the pages of four?

A Yes.

Q Beginning line 10, I asked you whether vitamin C is a treatment for cancer.

And then you said it is a treatment that we use for the immune system. Nothing that I'm doing is addressing cancer.

I asked you directly and then you answered the following.

What's your answer?

A Because cancer is a symptom, so I'm not going to address it
directly, so I'm trying to direct it to the underlying immunosuppression and the issue of toxicity.

Q So when these patients come to you and they're coming to you because -- I mean, let's go -- Patients A, B and C came to you because they had been referred to hospice?

A That's correct.

Q And --

A But I think actually that Patient C had not been -- he was not in hospice, A and B were in hospice.

Q Okay. And what -- did you see them initially -- all initially?

A I saw all three initially, but I did not scribe the note.

In these three patients I saw them all initially, yes.

Q What do you tell them?

A Don't really tell them much of anything, I'm listening to them most of the time because I get their history, what they've gone through, what they've been exposed to, what their, you know, history has been that led them to that point.

And it's usually pretty extensive because they've got charts, they've got scans, they've, you know, very thorough paperwork, they've got laboratory results, so it's pretty much mostly listening and collecting information and seeing what's pertinent.
Q Do they ask you questions?
A Generally speaking after we're done collecting the history, they may ask me some question, but most of them have already come seeking me out. They've done whatever research they've done. It's not that I have to convince them of anything.

Q What kind of questions do they ask you?
A They ask me questions -- I mean, they're varied. They ask me if they're going to feel nausea and vomiting when they're getting treatments. They ask me what are my chances.

Q What do you tell them when they ask you that?
A I tell them I'm only a man, God is the only one who determines that.

Q Would they ask if you -- if they -- if you can help them?
A If they ask me if -- they ask me if I can help them, yes, I've been asked that.

Q And what do you tell them?
A I tell them that I'm going to do my best, if I can.

Q Do you say that you can help them?
A No, I don't say I can do anything until I've made a determination after reviewing everything whether or not I can help them.

Q And -- and you said they come with you with -- excuse me, with labs and scans and -- and all kinds of medical records?
AYes.

Q And you review that?

AYes.

Q And --

AI may not review it when I'm with the patient right there, but I review it, you know, later on at the end of the day or whatever.

Q And I'm trying to understand why you review it because it seems as though despite what the records and scans may say, they're all still going to get the same treatments.

AWell, they're not getting the same treatments. If you look at the treatments you will see that the incidents of the treatments, the frequency of the treatments, the dosage of the treatments, even the -- even the constituents of the treatments.

For instance, Ms. -- Ms. -- well, Patient A received lipoic acid. That's how -- lipoic acid with selenium intravenously. That's the reason I was able to get her liver functioning again. That's documented with liver function tests over a week and a half period.

I can give you the exact numbers, but her -- but her LFTs -- I'm going to find that chart, but I've got -- I've got the dates from -- from 7/31 to 8/03, in that four-day period.
that she had drops in her liver functions tests based upon
the lipoic acid, selenium intravenous drips that I give
her.

But Patient B and Patient C did not receive that because
they didn't have an issue with their liver.
Or for instance Patient C received IRRs more frequently
because he had an actual perceivable deficit. He was
actually experiencing shortness of breath, whereas Patient
A and Patient B did not experience that. Patient A started
experiencing it more towards the end.

So each one of these patients is getting treatment that's
based upon them. We write orders -- you have the order
sheets there, you can see how often orders are written
and what things are different. We have a general protocol
and then we adjust it based upon each patient.

QIs there a point where the cancer has spread so much that you
will look at the scan and say I just can't do anything?
APatient A is an example of that, yes.
QOkay. And tell me why, what happened there.

AAAs I had previously said, the patient was now in organ failure.

When she came to me my goal was to up-regulate her liver
if I could do that and it was successful for the first
four, five, six days.
Her pain medicine levels -- excuse me, the level of pain she had was better and she didn't need as much narcotics and she was able to actually stop all of her narcotics for a period of five, six days, whatever it says in the chart.

And she had symptomatic reduction off abdominal distention, she had better energy, but then it started deteriorating again. That was correlated with her liver functions going up again.

So in that patient, it was obvious that she was already in organ failure. And if somebody is in organ failure, now the burden that is upon us as clinicians to try to help stimulate their immune system and to help detoxify their system becomes expeditiously more difficult, if not impossible.

Q And -- and with Patient C, the male patient.

A Patient C.

Q At some point he came back with you and he went through all these protocols and -- and he showed you some scans, correct? He went through a radiation oncologist and brought back with him --

A Yes, he did.

Q -- some scans?
AYes.

QAnd the result of that scan was to show that his cancer still spread?

AThis is -- are you talking about when he went to Mexico.

QNo, I'm talking about what he -- right before he stopped treatment.

AActually, that scan was done because I wanted the -- the doctors in Mexico to have a baseline of where he was. I did not -- I did not review those test results with him because he had the CAT scan done and the day -- the last day I saw him, I said that the tests were due today or tomorrow. I don't remember. It was like -- it was coming up very soon, so I did not have an opportunity to go over those tests with him directly.

QSo let's -- well, I guess let's go back to things that we can agree on. Patient C began your protocol with hydrogen, ozone, just like the others?

AYes.

QAnd his cancer, nonetheless, still spread?

AYes.

QPatient A began your protocol and her cancer kept spreading?

APatient A, is that what you said?

QUh-huh (yes).
ANow, Patient A was, as I said, already in -- in organ failure.

QAnd she -- she would die while she was basically there in Mecklenburg County in treatments from your office?

AYes.

QAnd Patient B, she began your protocols and her cancer still spread and she would later die in several months?

AWell, all -- all these patients have been told they were going to die. Each one of these patients outlived their expectancy. Patient A was told that she was a week, two weeks, three weeks, I'm not -- I don't remember directly exactly what she told, but she was when she came to me looked -- I mean, she was completely cathectic. She was partially obtunded. She was in dire straits. In fact, my recollection is that we gave her nutrients right -- right away because she was devoid.

Patient B was told that he had -- if I remember correctly, Patient B was told that she had less than three months.

She eventually succumbed to a cancer more than five months after she finished our treatment -- and she didn't even finish our treatment. She only had maybe three and a half of four weeks of IV treatments. She was the one that was discharged and so she outlived her expectancy with only partial treatment.
And Patient C was -- he -- that was his second round.

He was the one that had the colostomy after the sigmoid resection. He had the nephrectomy, the splenectomy, the adrenalectomy. And when he came to me he had cancer that spread, as I read in the chart, had already metastasized to his liver and to his lungs.

I don't remember offhand what they told him how long he had, but he's the patient that I remember that was under a severe amount of duress. And so I don't remember what his life expectancy was, but he died of a pulmonary emboli from what I understand.

Q: And you said they were all told they were going to die, correct?
A: Yes.

Q: Did you tell them that?
A: I didn't need to tell them. Why would I reinforce what somebody else had said that they're going to die? We're all going to die, we just don't know how we're going to die.

Q: Why would you not tell them that?
A: Because my job is not to play God. My job is to do my best to take care of my patients.

Q: If you have a bunch of scans and x-rays and -- and other medical information and you look at it and the patient has a very terminal illness, a very bad illness, would it be expected...
that you tell the patient honestly what you think is going
to happen to them?
AI think the best way for me to maybe explain this is by, if
you will -- if the respective Members of the Board will
indulge me, I will try to explain this in a way that may
make you understand how I think. Is that all right?

QI mean --
AI'm going to try to answer your question.

Q-- if you could be responsive to the question --
AYes.

QYou know, if -- if it looks very dire from the medical record,
the cancer has spread throughout the body, they're in organ
failure --

AAbsolutely.

Q-- why not be honest with them?
AWell, they've already had honestly, that's not what they need
at that point. They need reassurance at that point.

But in my third postgraduate year in training and surgery,
I was with my chief resident. At Brooke Army Medical
Center we had a retired general with pancreatic cancer
who had end-stage disease. He was in organ failure. And
I sat there with -- with my chief resident who was
explaining to this gentleman what was going to happen and
what we were going to try to do, how we were going to control
his nausea.
And this retired general asked my chief resident, how much
time do I have.
And my chief resident said, sir, I don't know how much
time you have. I don't know how much I have. What we
have to remember is that we are not the deciding factors.

That night my chief resident drove home and was hit by
a truck and he died. And he had just said that story less
than five hours before he died.
So you see, I don't know when I'm going to be taken out,
I don't know when you're going to be taken out, I don't
know when anybody is going to be taken out, but I am not
God and I refuse to tell a patient that they're going to
die when every human being on this planet is going to die.
QI understand the -- you know, sort of the old saying that as
soon as you're born, you start dying.
AThat's correct.
QAnd -- but some people have a better idea when they get a serious
illness about when that time may come. So you refuse to
tell them even though you have a very bad picture when
they come in to you, but you are willing to treat them,
correct?

AWell, that would not be accurate because when they come to me, they're usually telling me that this is what my doctor told me, I have this much time left to live. I'm not sure why I would, as a physician, reiterate what they're already telling me.

In the case of Patient -- in the case of Patient A, when it became obvious that this patient -- that even what I was doing was not helping this patient, I had the discussion with the daughter. And -- and the patient wouldn't even come into the room because she didn't want to hear possibly what I was going to say.

I don't know if you've ever been in that situation, Mr. Jimison, but I have been in that situation more than once and I can tell you it is not an easy situation. And I can tell you that any person that is put in a situation like that, it is a difficult situation to deal with.

I cannot in good faith know that I have to face my creator one day and tell him that I made your decisions. So I -- I've taken an oath to do no harm and I've taken an oath to do my best.

If I'm going to start telling patients that there's nothing that's going to be able to support your system, that you
need to go and die, then maybe Dr. Kevorkian is the right person because he, at least, puts them out of their misery.

My point is very simple, I do what I can. Either I do that or I should alleviate their misery. We call it humane when you put a person -- or when we put a dog down, but we don't do that with humans. Why don't we do that with humans? Because we're trying to help them.

Q Dr. Buttar, if -- has there ever been an occasion where one of these end-stage cancer patients come to you and they bring you all their medical records and you review all their scans and you just look at it and you actually agree with their oncologist, there's nothing else to be done --

A Well, the patient that you saw, the Stage IV cancer patient with multiple metastatic sights to her skull, to her liver, her spleen, -- (inaudible), she was told that. She was given six months to live, that was five years ago. She's PET scan negative now.

So how can I make that decision? I -- I can't make that decision. I can only do one thing and that is do my best.

If my best is not good enough, then at least I know that I did my best, that's all I can do.

Q All I'm asking, again, I'm just trying to get a better response
to the question I'm asking.

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection to a better response.

MR. JIMISON: Well, it's not --

MS. GODFREY: I mean --

MR. JIMISON: -- a better -- an actual response. A
response --

Q(By Mr. Jimison) Have you ever agreed --

MS. GODFREY: You might not be hearing what he wants to
hear, but that --

QBut the question was, have you ever agreed with a doctor, that's
all? I mean, an end-stage cancer patient comes in and
presents to you, you look at their charts and you actually
agree.

Has there ever been that occasion when you actually agreed
with the oncologist that there's nothing that you could
do and there's nothing that medicine can do for this
patient?

AI think I've answered that, that I would be throwing that person
out and they're not coming to me any more because they
think that I'm going to do chemo or radiation or surgery
on them.

They're coming to see if I can help them. I've had --
I've had a patient that was brought to me with soft tissue
sarcoma who had lost over 100 pounds when he came to me
and he was there because his family brought him to me.
His family believed that I could help them.
And while I was doing his physical, he was alone with me
and he said -- he asked me a simple question. He said,
can you help me?
And I said, sir, I don't know.
And he said, well, I know that it's important to my family
because I'm ready to go, but whatever they want to do,
let them do it.
So what am I supposed to do, tell this man that no -- I
mean, the family needed that -- that sense. I mean, it
wasn't even by the patient, the patient himself had already
resolved the fact. He told me, he said, I'm at peace with
my maker, I'm welcoming my -- I don't -- I think his belief
system was -- I think he's a Christian or I don't remember,
but he was ready to go.
But he asked me to do whatever the family wanted to do
because he wanted them to feel that they had done everything
in their power to save their father. So how am I to sit
there and tell them that, no, I'm not going to do
everything.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Mr. Jimison, I think -- well, he's
answered that question.

Q Let's go to page 60 of your deposition. You said that you were on the cutting edge of medicine, correct?

A Well, I would like to think that.

Q And why do you say that you are on the cutting edge?

A Because more and more doctors are realizing that there's something wrong with the way that we've been taught. We've been taught -- we've been taught something that we thought was the right way, but after the Genome Project, it's become very clear and Dr. Peterson even testified to this, that there's more and more heterogenicity that they're finding and there's something that's wrong.

Because we usually think that the Genome Project that -- that was portrayed to be the cure for all and that would give us all the information we needed for chronic disease -- would give us the information that we needed to find out which genes to turn on and which genes to turn off.

However, we know that there's over 100,000 identified -- identifiable proteins and yet there's only 21,000 genes in the Genome. In fact, the difference between the Genome and between a human and the -- (inaudible) -- is less than 600 genes, so there must be something else that's going
on.

And Bruce Lipton in his work clearly show and he's extensively well published, he was in fact involved with the Genome Project and his own educational series now about the biology belief, talk about the fact that there is something that is a signal that causes the gene to create a protein one way or the other way. That is a toxic substance. Something that is -- causes a configuration change within the actual gene to elicit a different protein. So the same gene can actually define multiple proteins.

QWhy do you think you personally are on that cutting edge? ABecause he verified and justified my entire 17 years -- or actually 11 years of clinical practice by his work in didactics that it is the signal. It is something that causes a disruption within our system. Each cell in the human body has over 100,000 reactions per second and there's over 50 trillion cells in the human body. This is the mechanism that's going on within our system.

There's something that is introduced. Why do you not have cancer, thank God you don't, and why does a person have cancer. What is the difference? And what makes one person have it and the other person not?
My goal is to find out what turned that on and try to reinstate the state of the body back to the state before that cancer became obvious. We all have cancer in our bodies. Cancer cells are there constantly, but the apoptotic mechanisms are there to prevent the cancer from becoming fulminant and becoming rampant in our system. So what keeps my cancer cells in control and my cancer patient's cell, let them become out of control. That is what I'm trying to define. That is what I'm trying to identify. That is what I'm trying to resolve.

Q Let me see if you still agree with this. When I asked you about why you call yourself on the cutting edge you said -- and this is on line 24, page 60: That's why it's called advanced medicine.

And I asked you what do you mean by that? And this is on top of page 61.
That's why I named my clinic it's the Center for Advanced Medicine because we believe we're practicing medicine 15 to 20 years ahead of it's time.

A That is absolutely correct.

Q And I keep going, I said -- now, if you go down to line 7, I'm basically trying to ask --
AIn the same -- in the same box?

QThe same box on page 61. I'm asking you: Do you know something that others don't. And I ask you and you say: That's exactly what I'm saying.

And then I ask you: How do you come to this conclusion that you know more and others don't.

So I'm asking you for the Board Members, why do you know things that others don't?

AWell, it's not that I know things that others don't, but I have become -- I've started seeing and observing certain things. The purest form of science is observation according to Hippocrates -- excuse me, according to Socrates, and that is what I do, I observe.

The people that have come through our training program, people such as pediatric, a cardiologist, Dr. Philbert in California or the orthopaedic cancer surgeon from Harvard, or any of these doctors that have come through my course, they're coming not because I'm going to teach them something different about orthopaedics or cardiovascular disease because they know way more than I do. I've had four oncologists that have come through my training program. They know more about cancer than I'll ever know in my life.
But they're coming because they understand that what we're doing is causing a fundamental change in the physiology to start to allow the system to start operation again. All I'm doing -- I'm nothing more than a glorified garbage man. I'm pulling out things that are garbage inside the body, that's all I'm doing.

It is not rocket science. It is a simple thing. The key is, how effective are people at pulling out things that shouldn't be in the body, that's it.

Q: How does hydrogen peroxide pull things out of the body?
A: Hydrogen peroxide is actually a secondary mechanism, not pulling stuff out of the body, but more stimulating the immune system.

Q: And ozone therapy, how is that --
A: Ozone is actually both. Actually, that's a great question. Ozone has been shown in multiple studies -- I mean, some of those have been provided, and are phenomenal at pulling out persistent organic pollutants, the fluorinated hydrocarbons, the benzenes, the -- (inaudible) -- the organophosphates.

My -- my last meeting with the Center for Disease Control, their number one -- the number one issue that I thought would be their number one concern, it ended up being
mercury, but it was based on alphabetical order and it was -- (inaudible) -- hydrocarbons.
The only thing that has been -- the reason they call them POPS or persistent organic pollutants is because once they enter the body they can't be excreted.
If you look at the liver and you look at COT polymorphisms, Phase I, Phase II, the conjugation of the pupil, -- (inaudible) -- system into the liver, these chemicals cannot be processed through the liver. So what we do is, we try to, one, up-regulate the liver; and, two, we try to give the body something that can breakdown this persistent organic -- (inaudible) --so that they are no longer persistent.
Ozone happens to be one of those therapies and this is well documented in the journal literature as well as -- the journal literature is the most extensive. There's a couple of other pieces of literature.
In fact, Baylor Oncology of Medicine in the 1960s and we provided those documents to my counsel. There are five different publications in -- in the Journal of Thoracic Surgery that was done by surgeons where they used ozone to show the change within the system. This was done in the 1960s. This was -- this was all stuff done at Baylor.
Q: For the benefit of the Board Members and perhaps to benefit everybody in the room, I want to try to go as fast as possible. So -- and I want to use some of the exhibits and just want you to verify things and hopefully we can get done fairly quickly, but hopefully the exhibits won't be too bad.

Can you turn to Exhibit 8?

A: In the same book?

MS. GODFREY: In whose book?

MR. JIMISON: My book.

AEight in the thin book.

QEeight.

AI'm there.

Q: Okay. Patient C, he was treated --

Asir, Patient -- Exhibit 8 is my CV.

QI know, but I just wanted to get you to --

AOh, I'm sorry, excuse me.

Q-- the exhibit when I ask the questions.

AI'm sorry.

QTo your knowledge or memory, you have the medical records in front of you, was Patient C treated essentially from April 26th to June 11th of '04?

MS. GODFREY: The patient, which one?
WITNESS: Patient C.

MR. JIMISON: Patient C.

A The gentleman.

Q From the end of April to sort of early, mid June?

A I believe so. I believe that's correct.

Q In 2004?

A Uh-huh (yes).

Q Okay. And Patient B was essentially around the same time, correct?

A Patient B was -- yeah, essentially, yeah. Patient -- Patient C actually came earlier, though.

Q Okay. But sort of around April to June --

A Yes.

Q -- 2004?

A Yes.

Q And they were getting treatments five days a week, 40 hours a week in your office during that time?

A You know, I would have to go back. I think it was four days a week because Fridays -- we were only open certain days when we had cancer patients that were scheduled. But it wasn't a regular thing on Fridays, it all depended.

Q And --

A But generally speaking, yes.
Q-- if you go to the part on Exhibit 8 --
AExhibit 8?
Q-- to your lecture schedule.
AExhibit 8, you said?
QUh-huh (yes). Which is page 4 of the exhibit, the first page of your lecture schedule. Turn to page 3, starting at number 29 you talked about this Congressional testimony.
AYes.
QYou were out of the office on May 6, 2004?
AThat's correct.
QAnd then you were out of the office on May 21st -- May 23rd, 2004.
AThat's correct. This is -- either May 6th wasn't a weekend, but the May 21st, 23rd, that was over a weekend.
QAnd that was in Brazil?
AThat was in Brazil.
QAnd -- and then you were out of the office from May 28th to May 30th?
AThat's correct. That was also a weekend.
QAnd June 4th to June 6th?
AThat was also a weekend, that's correct.
QAnd June 18th, June 19th?
AI have a lecture almost every weekend.
Q: Are you out of the office during weekdays?
A: I'm occasionally out of the office during the weekdays, yes.

    Generally speaking, it's only when it's something of urgency, otherwise my -- my lecture -- doctors don't come to conferences during weekdays, so it's usually on the weekends.

    I have flown from here to Veronia and been back in less than 60 hours. I've done this numerous times. And I have done this numerous times on my trip to Brazil. I was only on the ground in Brazil for maybe nine hours just to give my lecture. I give two lectures and then I left.

    That's -- that is -- that is accurate.

Q: And June -- number 35, June 24th through June 28th?
A: Yes.

Q: And that was in Spain?
A: Yes.

Q: And let's look at some of the things you're actually lecturing on. Go to --
A: Same page?

Q: Let's go to number 4 -- page 4 which will be page 7.
A: Okay.

Q: Number 46, The Treatment of Cancer --
A: Uh-huh (yes).
Okay.

A-- Using Immune Modulating Peptid Analogs, okay.

QThen the next page, on Page 49.

APage 49. You mean Number 49.

QI'm sorry, yes. Course Chairman, Innovative Protocol for
Treating Chronic Disease, Cancer --

ACancer, Cardiovascular and Neurodegenerative Disease, all
three of them.

QHuh-huh (yes). And Number 52, the same course?

AYes. As I've said, it's debulking the toxic load and it's
stimulating the immune system in all chronic diseases.

QAnd Number 59, same course?

AYes.

QAnd Number 67, the same course?

AYes.

QAnd Number 72, the same course?

AYes.

QAnd Number 72, what?

QNumber 72.

AYeah, that's why they're all highlighted. You'll notice
they'll all bold for a specific reasons.

QAnd Number 62, if you go to Number 62.

ANumber 62?

QYou lectured on a topic called The Treatment of Cancer, a Five
Step Non-Traditional Medical Approach in the Treatment of Cancer.

AYes, that's what the lecture says.

QAnd you -- I mean, you were speaking during that time frame?
AYes.

QAnd that's the title you gave your lecture, correct?
AThat is correct, I did.

QAnd number -- the next Page 75, again, a course on Innovative Protocol for Treating Chronic Disease Cancer, Cardiovascular and Neurodegenerative?
AYes.

QAnd when people -- do doctors pay a fee to come to these courses?
ADo doctors -- I'm sorry?
QDo doctors pay a fee to come to these courses?
AAbsolutely.

QAnd how much is that fee?
A$20,000.

QAnd where does that fee go to?
ATo the AMESPA Group.

QWho is the AMESPA Group?
AAMESPA is an organization that is -- it stands for the Advanced Medical Education and Services Physician Association.

QAnd what's your connection with that?
AI founded it, I organized it and I've been paid $4.35 for that organization since I accepted it in 2005 and the balance sheet shows it.

We also opened up a foundation -- a children's foundation for AMESPA where contributions are now being made for the treatment of children that have succumbed to chronic diseases such as cancer, autism, these type of chronic diseases.

And I resent any implication that you have of those funds --

Q: Just answer the question.

A: I'm just answering the question, but I --

Q: I didn't ask a question.

A: -- I've gotten $4.35 from that organization because I forgot my credit card one day for lunch.

Q: So your 20,000 -- $20,000 that doctors pay that doesn't go to you?

A: That does not go to me. You're welcome to inspect those -- those documents and those -- where that money exists.

Q: Let's now go to --

A: In fact, I'll be happy to tell the Board where that money goes and for what purpose it is set aside, if Mr. Jimison would like to know.

Q: Sure.
That money is set aside and has a balance of about $300,000 in that account and it is set aside to protect the interest and the rights of doctors to practice medicine freely. And it is -- has doctors from three different countries -- I'm sorry, excuse me, four different countries. We have over 50 doctors that are part of that organization. And those funds have been set aside to help defend those doctors if they are brought up on charges of unethical conduct for practicing integrative medicine.

Well, that's kind of interesting. Are the funds from that organization being used to help defend you in these proceedings? I haven't used it yet because I have enough funds myself, but I may.

I'll withdraw the question. If you go to Exhibit -- it's for Patient C, I believe it's -- I'm sorry, what?

Q-- Tab 2 in the Board's big notebook.

MS. GODFREY: Tab 2 in the Board's notebook.

I'm sorry, you said Patient what?

QPatient C.

AAnd Tab 2? Is this the book? Like this one?

OOh, no.
Q: This one? Tab 2?
A: Yes. If you can look from page 153 all the way to, I think, it's 206.
Q: Page 153 to 206?
A: Uh-huh (yes).
Q: Okay.
A: What is that? Is that the biofeedback?
Q: Yes, it is. Yes, it is.
A: And essentially there are -- I guess if you do the math, 153 subtracted by 206, about 53 entries?
Q: If that is what it is, I'm -- if you want to count them, but --
A: Well, that does sound about right?
Q: That's probably right, yes.
A: And each of those are biofeedbacks that you administered to Patient C was $150, correct?
Q: I think that's what is on the chart, but that's not what's collected.
A: Does insurance pay for that?
Q: Sometimes they have in the past, but we don't deal with insurance companies any more, but they have in the past.
A: Why don't you collect the $150?
Q: Very simply because with cancer patients, they have a tremendous financial burden and we try to extend to them
every courtesy we can. These treatments are only recommended for the three times to see if the patient feels a difference. If the patient feels a difference, then they usually request it.

So our standing order is -- I think it's either three treatments or -- yeah, it's three treatments or four treatments. We basically do one week of treatments and then it's up to the patient to decide if they want to continue.

And I don't -- I cannot recollect a single patient that has not requested to continue with that because it makes them feel that much better.

QOkay. And go to page 265.

A265.

MR. KNOX: 265 or 255?

MR. JIMISON: 265.

WITNESS: 265.

AOkay, I'm there.

QYou're seeing a lot of bills for -- for IV infusions?

AYes, I am.

QTherapeutic or diagnostic injections?

AYes.

QBiofeedback?
AYes.

QAnd coffee enemas?

AThat's a kit that the patient gets.

QOkay. Chocolate protein powder?

AYes.

QAnd the total charges after adjustments, are what?

AI'm not -- it's my -- my one is one straight sheet down, it has dates of service of 5/27, 5/28, 6/01, 6/2, so I'm not sure which -- where's the total you're talking about.

QOn this -- the check payment on 6/11 or 6/02. The check payment AFor $1,409; is that right?

QUh-huh (yes).

AYeah.

QWould it be fair to say that most days Patient C paid close to over $1,000 for his treatments?

AIT would be probably a safe assessment to -- probably that that would be accurate. I'm not sure whether that's exactly right, but my financial -- I have a financial person that deals with those issues, so I don't usually deal with them, but I would think that's probably fair.

QHow many patients on average do you see a day?

ANow, I don't quite understand the question because there's different types -- there's different things that we see,
so I may not have -- if you -- you need to clarify that.

Q How many patients does your clinic usually see a day?

A For everything?

Q Uh-huh (yes).

A Oh, goodness. Well, basically we -- we don't see any more than two new patients in a day. So on a busy day we may see -- now, are you talking about IVs for this type or the charge of $1,000 a day?

Q No, just -- just the number of patients your clinic sees a day?

A It can vary. I mean, some days we've only had four patients and some days we've had 40, so I really couldn't --

Q How many cancer patients do you see -- are you presently treating?

A Presently I'm treating two cancer patients -- well, I'm -- in the first -- the number of patients that I'm seeing right now in their first phase of their detoxification?

Two that have cancer, but I have numerous patients that have already gone through all that process and they're -- some of them are here today and some of them you saw, but they're not in my clinic every day. They may -- I may see them once every six months, I may see them once every year. Some of them I haven't seen
in a year and a half. I've got two -- two doctors that are patients of mine with cancer. I haven't seen -- I've got an appointment with one of them coming up, but I haven't seen him for a year and a half.

Q The -- you testified in direct testimony when Ms. Godfrey asked you about the 100 percent success rate that was spoken about by Patient C's wife. And you said that -- and correct me if I'm paraphrasing this wrong, that -- that you would never tell the patient about a success rate for treatments.

A No. I said that I can't tell them what a success rate is because it's going to be irrelevant to them. I have said to -- I've said to patients that I've got patients that have failed everything else and they're still alive today after they've gone through our type of therapy, but I've never quoted any type of percentage that I can remember.

Q Have you ever quoted a percentage for any therapy?

A I've probably -- yeah, but I'd say for like IRRs, I'd say 95 percent effective or maybe even -- I would probably say that's about the closest that you can get to an always-and-never thing because IRRs, if done -- administered appropriately, they're absolutely phenomenal. I think it's -- I think it's a great, great therapy.
And the question one of the Board Members had asked, why do you think that -- I think, Dr. Walker, you asked that question -- why hasn't that been more prevalent and I -- I can honestly say I believe it's because of the influence of pharmaceutical company. Dr. Philbert did an extensive writeup and published this in a journal of family practice.

It is absolutely the most phenomenal therapy that I've ever seen. It is inexpensive, it is quick, it is a rapid response onset of efficacy, yet it's not done. And every doctor that has come to my course has learned how to do it.

In fact, the North Carolina Medical Board, that is the reason that I talked with Mr. Mansfield about being able to get that permission to teach doctors how to do that treatment. And was very happy to have that response from Mr. Mansfield and I also got permission for South Carolina because that's literally the two states that we teach the course in. That's just because it's convenient for us to teach in those two states, but doctors come in from all over the world. And so I've been able to teach doctors that particular treatment.

That treatment I would say is 95 percent or more efficacy,
Anything else you said had a percent success rate?

I know I've said that according to -- a 42 percent efficacy of antibodies before they release -- before the FDA releases it. I'm sure I've quoted some kind of percentages. I know that pancreatic cancer has a 2 percent survival, one year -- well, one year of survival is 2 percent and two years survival is zero percent, so I may have said things like that. I honestly can't remember all the different things I may have said in the past.

Okay. Going back to your pamphlet which we passed out, could you turn to page 3?

I don't have a copy of that.

All right.

MS. GODFREY: Page 3. We still don't have a copy, right?

Let me just hand to you my copy. Look at the one, two -- the third paragraph. Could you read the third bullet point on that page?

Effective, yes. There's a 95 percent success rate with efficacy of allergies -- effectively resolve all allergies in patients easily without difficulty with 95 percent success rate of treatment.

But this isn't -- this isn't for patients, this is for
All right. At some point and I'll try to do this within five minutes, the -- you sent out an e-mail, correct, to your patients after the Medical Board charges?

I did.

And that e-mail basically made reference to -- why did you send out that e-mail?

Because based upon what the Medical Board already knows about my practice and based upon nine visits and numerous chart reviews and everything else, I wanted my patients to be -- my patients are very open with me and I'm very open to my patients, so I wanted them to know the false allegations against me by the North Carolina Medical Board and so I notified them.

I know that those egregious allegations against me were designed to undermine my character, a character assassination, and I wanted my patients to know the truth.

In fact, my patients were calling me asking me what is this kind of garbage, what is happening, why are they doing this. And so I sent out the e-mail to make it easier for me to respond rather than an individual response to each person that was calling and talking.
Let me hand you a copy of that e-mail and a copy to your counsel.

You said in that e-mail, second paragraph: I have seen the comments by two experts the North Carolina Medical Board retained to review our patient records. Their assessments have been invalidated point by point and we are looking forward to proving this case to be not only without merit at the upcoming hearing, but an example of how the various state medical boards are singling out doctors who don't prescribe one drug after another. Already one of the two experts is now refusing to testify against us.

Is that correct?

That's what you notified us about. I only know what I was told by my counsel that you told them.

Okay. And one of those two experts was an integrative medicine doctor?

MS. GODFREY: Objection.

MR. KNOX: Objection.

Okay. And you talked about -- and if we can get the Medical Practice Act and I think we passed this all out.

AI just know that we have nine experts and you limited us to
three and you had these cases since 2006 and all you could
find was the one person.

Q I'm going to read to you -- you said you were involved with
the law -- do you have another copy?

A Mr. Jimison, I think you've already changed the law since we --
since we changed it. The eternal price of freedom is
constant vigilance and we failed or dropped the ball
because we weren't constantly vigilant, so we know you've
already changed it again.

Q I want to read to you 90-14(a)(g).

A I don't have that document.

Q I'll hand you that. You now have 90-14(a)(g), subparagraph
(g).

A Subparagraph (g), I'm there.

Q It says: Prior to taking action against a licensee to practice
integrative medicine for providing care not equivalent
to his practice for the procedures or treatments
administered, the Board shall consult the licensee to
practice integrative medicine. Correct?

A That's what it says, yes.

Q And the expert that you referred to in the e-mail was the expert
that practices integrative medicine that the Board
consulted with, correct?
MR. KNOX: Well, objection. He said he didn't know. And
the second thing is that person is not labeled a witness
or in the procedure. At some point we must be involved
--
MR. JIMISON: I'm just saying -- I just want to establish
through Dr. Buttar that the Board made the consultation
prior to charges --
MS. GODFREY: Well, I don't think Dr. Buttar has any
personal knowledge of what the Board did --
MR. JIMISON: Well, the Board --
MS. GODFREY: -- in investigating his own case.
MR. JIMISON: The personal knowledge is reflected from
his e-mail.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, we don't have a copy of the e-mail,
so we don't --
MR. JIMISON: Okay. I understand.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: What we heard you say, it wasn't clear.
MR. JIMISON: Yeah. If I could just have a minute while
Ms. Carpenter goes to copy those. I think it will take
her a few seconds. If we could have a minute. And then
this will be sort of the last few questions and then I'll
be done.
MR. KNOX: Well, I know I'm being -- we are running behind,
and I know you've done all you can, but this was supposed
to take 20 minutes and it's hour.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: That's all right, we'll give you your
time.
MR. KNOX: I know.
WITNESS: Ma'am, is it appropriate for me to stand up and
stretch my legs?
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Please do.
WITNESS: I appreciate that, thank you.
DR. McCULLOCH: Mr. Knox?
MR. KNOX: Yes, sir.
DR. McCULLOCH: Are you claiming that running over is a
one-sided event here today?
MR. KNOX: Well, I'm not sure who said what, but I haven't
said anything today so I can be critical, do you understand?
I wasn't in either one of those.
Q(By Mr. Jimison) So you write in the first -- you actually
write in the very first sentence of that second paragraph
that you have seen the comments by the two experts the
North Carolina Medical Board retained to review the patient
records.
AYes.
QAnd so you actually saw the worksheets, the comments that they
wrote?
AI was given those to respond to them.
QOkay. And one was from a UNC neurologist?
AYes. There's a -- yes, that's correct.
QA Dr. Mann?
AI believe that's -- that's correct. I'm not sure if it's the
same Dr. Mann that I know, but I was told it was not, but --
QOkay. And the -- and that review was not favorable to you,
was it not?
MR. KNOX: Well, objection.
MS. GODFREY: Well, objection.
AI think that's the reason you didn't bring it in because it
was.
QIt was favorable to you?
AWell, obviously that's why one -- I mean, it said that --
MR. KNOX: Wait a minute. I'm sorry, Doctor. I mean,
the reason we objected is that person has been discarded
by the Board as a potential witness, so we never did a
deposition and now to say that doctor was not favorable
or was favorable to you is grossly unfair.
MR. JIMISON: Okay. Well, let me just -- let me -- let
me withdraw that --
MR. KNOX: May I ask --
MR. JIMISON: I'll just withdraw the question. I'll just withdraw the question.

MR. KNOX: Thank you.

Q (By Mr. Jimison) The -- the law that we're talking about 90-14(a)(g) that you said you were part of, it just says, the Board shall consult --

MR. KNOX: Well, object to what the law says. That's not a question. He's examined this witness and he does not --

MS. GODFREY: That's a --

MR. KNOX: I mean, what he's trying to do is prove indirectly what he failed to show on direct and it's too late.

MR. JIMISON: That'll be all.

MR. KNOX: Thank you, sir. You can step down.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, wait a minute.

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry, I thought -- he said that was all.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: That's all on his part.

MR. KNOX: Okay.

WITNESS: This is all of his part right here.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. did you want to redirect anything?

MS. GODFREY: No. I think the Board is the best redirect.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Did Mr. Jimison recross? Okay.
Now, we'll go to the Board Members.

Dr. McCulloch?

DR. McCULLOCH: Oh, sure.

**EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:**

DR. McCULLOCH: Not surprising through a lengthy testimony you might say some things are -- are perhaps contradictory, but -- and I don't want to pick -- pick on necessarily, but there is one point that bothers me. You said that -- you said, I treat cancer by treating the cause.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: And then you said, we don't know the cause of cancer.

WITNESS: We don't know the full cause of cancer, sir, but we know that there's a --

DR. McCULLOCH: We should be able to find the cause of cancer.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: And this gets to my problem that I have that we've been alluding to all along, is this total lack, apparently to me, of studies of scientific knowledge that isn't -- that there's no basis for what you're doing, in my opinion. And -- and perhaps that's my shortcoming.

One of the things that we are concerned about and we know
talking about the law, we -- we are aware that the law recognizes in traditional medicines, a lack of full understanding of what you do.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: But the law also says that we want to make sure that you don't cause harm.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: And in reading what appears to be reasonable literature from, for instance, Sloan-Kettering, talking about hydrogen peroxide therapy --

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: -- it's dangerous stuff.

WITNESS: Sir, it was also considered inappropriate and dangerous -- well, I don't want to get to -- or, you know, washing your hands is considered to be ridiculous, but I won't get into that. If I -- if I may answer your question about the -- about the causes because these documents have been provided and these are -- these are journal -- these are well repudiated.

DR. McCULLOCH: I'd rather just -- I'd rather not go into that. I just wanted to point out what I consider a --

WITNESS: I may not --

DR. McCULLOCH: And the reason why I don't want to go into
that is because I know what you're going to say.

WITNESS: Well, it's just basically --

DR. McCULLOCH: It will be a long litany --

WITNESS: No, sir, it'll --

DR. McCULLOCH: -- of stuff that I don't understand.

WITNESS: No, it'll be 30 seconds, sir, actually.

DR. McCULLOCH: All right, go ahead.

WITNESS: If you'll allow me to be to -- there's a cancer statistics 1998 that was put out by the National Cancer Institute. I believe we have the reference here and it's a 35 page document.

And in that document, sir it talks about the causes of cancer and we have the slides that I've used actually in presentations to show this and it was concurred by -- with the head of the -- Dr. -- (inaudible) Vega -- the head of radiation oncology that 75 to 95 percent of all cancers according to the National -- National Cancer Institute are directly related to some form of a toxicity.

So my question was -- I apologize if I didn't get this across, my goal is to try to address that toxicity that is with the cause. I don't know what all the causes are, but that's what I'm trying to address.

DR. McCULLOCH: I understand that and you're addressing
that with a blanket treatment without any study, without any controls, without any knowledge of really what your results are.

WITNESS: I'm using the same method that was used to evaluate the coronary artery bypass graph, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: In an EDTA treatment or what?

WITNESS: No, sir. To assess the efficacy of coronary artery bypass graph. There was no double-blind placebo-controlled randomized cross-over studies.

DR. McCULLOCH: Oh, okay, so it's all right.

WITNESS: Well, no, I'm not saying it's all right, sir. I'm just saying that I'm using the same thing based upon empiric evidence.

DR. McCULLOCH: All right. Just a technical point, you were talking about the overhead and you listed the overhead in your costs.

WITNESS: Yes, sir. Well, my -- my accountant and my financial manager did, yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: How did you determine the overhead? That was the biggest part of your cost and the IV.

WITNESS: Yes, sir. It was -- it was based upon everything from payroll --

DR. McCULLOCH: Payroll, light bill, benefits, dah, dah,
dah, dah, dah --

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: -- which is for -- for that period of time as it is --

WITNESS: Yes, sir, as it went -- I'm sorry, say again.

DR. McCULLOCH: For that period of time that the IVs were --

WITNESS: No, sir, it's based upon total dollars coming in. In other words, our cost of overhead when you take the cost of goods sold and then you take total expenses and you take total gross revenue that's coming in, when you subtract it out, that's what the percentage came out to be and that was --

DR. McCULLOCH: How did you come up with $75 for an overhead for starting an IV?

WITNESS: Sir, I did not do that. As I said, it was my accountant and my chief financial officer. I just -- because I don't deal with the number aspect, but that's how they come up with it based upon what our rents are and, you know, our overhead costs.

DR. McCULLOCH: Well, my guess is they probably looked at the -- it's a two-hour infusion, they're probably looking at your two-hour overhead. And my problem with
that is, that it's counting --

WITNESS: I don't believe that's correct, sir, because

my revenue --

DR. McCulloch: I mean, that's assuming that your overhead
is not taking care of anything else during that two-hour
period of time. Your payroll for instance, you're taking
care of other patients at the same time.

WITNESS: Yes, sir, that is how it is reflected, that's
right. It's not -- it was extrapolated out to be based
upon -- as I understand it at least, it's based upon the
total amount of revenue that's coming in, total amount
of cost of goods subtracted and then what was left over
and that amount from expenses versus what was profit and
they -- it came out to be something like 78 percent was
expenses and 22 percent was profit and then they calculated
it out based on that. I don't know exactly, but I believe
that's how they did it.

DR. McCULLOCH: How do you determine how many days a week
to treat somebody with hydrogen peroxide?

WITNESS: Well, sir, the hydrogen peroxide has gotten a
lot of attention --

DR. McCULLOCH: Well, okay, EDTA or whatever.

WITNESS: Well, hydrogen -- yeah, I was just going to say,
hydrogen peroxide is maybe done six times in that six-week period, but EDTA I generally only give a chelator once a week.

And the reason is, is because I don't want to deplete the essential minerals. In fact, that is the bigger concern, so I don't do it more than once a week.

I may on rare occasion -- I have had patients with very high levels who are tolerant of the treatments and I have gone more aggressively given two treatments in a week, but usually in between they get a mineral drip. I've maybe done that half a dozen times in -- in 11 years of doing this treatment, but generally speaking it's only once a week.

And also if we're giving -- (inaudible) -- sulfonic we won't do that but more often -- more often than once every two weeks.

DR. McCULLOCH: Okay. But these people are getting IVs?

WITNESS: The people that -- that are getting the immune modulation and some of those things, yes, sir, they can -- it can extend out that long. But the typical person that comes in for an EDTA, it's one gram per hour --
DR. McCULLOCH: I want to talk about the five-day-a-week people.

WITNESS: Oh, the five-day-a-week people, yes, sir. Some of those -- some of those may be an hour, an hour and fifteen minutes, some of the IVs and some of them may end up -- like EDTA for instance, if it's the full dose it's three hours.

DR. McCULLOCH: My question is, how -- how did you determine to do it five days a week as opposed to two days a week, as opposed to seven days a week.

WITNESS: Oh, I see what you're saying, sir. I actually started doing this when -- when we had the -- my first patients that came to me we actually did it only twice a week, but I didn't see it to be beneficial. And based upon some of the work at some of the conferences that I attended where I learned how other doctors are doing it and their doses, some of these people would actually have patients in hospitals like in Mexico and the Dominican and Costa Rica and some places in Europe, they actually had these patients getting drips throughout a 24 hour period so the patients would actually be in the hospital, they do everything and that's how they were getting their treatments. So obviously frequency of therapy was --
was an important component.

We actually increased it to three and we saw that there was some more benefit and then I went to four to see if there was more benefit. We were only open four days a week for a number of years, but because we needed to be open a fifth day for patients that were suffering from either neurodegenerative disease or, in this particular case, cancer, we needed to have that fifth day, so we did.

And we've actually had -- some of my staff that have actually come in even on Saturdays to do treatments if we thought patients needed it. But generally speaking, a weekend, I try to give them a respite because it is -- our patients don't have hair loss and nausea and all that, but it is taxing on their system and they need a day of recovery.

DR. McCULLOCH: That's all I have, thanks.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Dr. Walker?

DR. WALKER: Dr. Buttar, do you provide any charity care?

WITNESS: Yes, sir. I've been blessed to be able to treat every child that's come to us with cancer without charging them anything.

DR. WALKER: How about adults?
WITNESS: No, sir. I -- if I was doing that, then I would actually be probably flipping hamburgers for a living because I wouldn't be able to afford to --

DR. WALKER: So you can't afford to treat one or two people a month that might be in dire need of your services, you couldn't absorb that?

WITNESS: No, sir, I couldn't. I have done that with children and I -- I give a lot more to charity than 10 percent, so -- but I chose not to go and to take this type of risk that I'm sitting here before you that I'm being scrutinized for in doing charity work. It would not be, I think, a wise -- a wise decision on my part from a financial basis or business decision.

DR. WALKER: Now, you stated earlier and correct me if I'm wrong, we can refer back to the record --

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: -- when you were quoting cancer patient survival, you said that you believed that about 40 percent of the cancer patients that you've treated are still alive.

WITNESS: Sir, I think -- I think I may have said that and what I meant to say, that I -- I can say that 40 percent of my patients that I have treated have had cancer something in their life that are still alive. That's what I meant.
to say.

DR. WALKER: Okay. Do you have any idea how many patients with Stage IV cancer when they presented with that to you with Stage IV cancer are still alive?

WITNESS: I would say probably -- well, let's see --

DR. WALKER: You can say, I don't know, if you don't know that.

WITNESS: Well, I can tell -- I can give you definitely a minimum, I can't you tell about the top number. We've got -- there's eight of them on the web site talking about their results and they're still alive and they all had Stage IV.

DR. WALKER: The one that we saw today on the testimony with breast cancer that had metastasized to her thoracic spine, her spleen and her skull --

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: -- stated that, you know, she was five years down the road and her most recent PET scan was unremarkable, had no evidence.

WITNESS: That's right, sir.

DR. WALKER: However, she was also receiving Somata and hormone therapy. Now, do you have any idea of how many of your patients are not receiving any other type of therapy
except your therapy who are still alive?

WITNESS: Sir, those -- those other treatments that they were getting, she had already failed everything. She had been told that she only had six months to live. But all the other patients, I'm not familiar with all the different things, but I encourage my patients as you've seen in the consent forms that they must continue with whatever other therapies their primary care providers have recommended.

That's one reason that I have a close working relationship with a number of oncologists and I can name those oncologists, if you would like.

DR. WALKER: That's okay. On that question let me just clarify one thing.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: Obviously, if she's still being treated by an oncologist with two additional drugs that might appropriately be called some type of chemo therapy, she had not exhausted all therapy because she's still receiving and she's still agreeing to receive it. Just a little correction there.

WITNESS: Well, sir, she was told by her oncologist that they -- she had been refracted to chemotherapy and that
they were going to just treat her from a hormonal respective. That's what she was told. I'm just going by what the oncologist --

DR. WALKER: Okay. Well, we don't know what the oncologist really told her.

Have you ever heard of the concept, you don't treat the labs, we treat the patient?

WITNESS: Absolutely, sir.

DR. WALKER: And it seemed as though in many of these patients the definition of success was a diminution of various markers or an allegation of various immune markers. Is that not what you said that the patient's liver functions were getting better, that the patient's zero marker was decreasing, that the various immunologic markers which you measured were also improving?

WITNESS: Yes, sir, I did say that and that is exactly what I'm doing for two reasons. One --

DR. WALKER: I'm -- I'm just asking you if this is what you said.

WITNESS: Yes, sir, that is what I said.

DR. WALKER: And -- and did not two of these three patients die within the next few months?

WITNESS: One within four months and one within just a
few days.

DR. WALKER: Right.

WITNESS: Well, actually, excuse me. The one with the LFTs within a few days, yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: Have you ever not treated a patient?

WITNESS: Sir --

DR. WALKER: I'm not asking for your philosophy, I'm just asking a simply question. Have you ever not treated a patient?

WITNESS: I have never not treated a patient, sir.

DR. WALKER: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Dr. Buttar, early on in your testimony you said you left the military in 1996 and you were doing ER work at the time and you said, I could have become certified by the American Organization of Physician Specialists. Did you ever get certified by them?

WITNESS: For emergency medicine, ma'am, no, I did not. I -- but the emergency rooms that I was working at took my experience with the military as sufficient and I wasn't sure if I was going to stay in medicine and that's one reason that I decided that I would not pursue that course --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.
WITNESS: -- that course of action.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I want to go back to the small notebook to Tab 21 and --

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We'll go back to page 4 of that.

WITNESS: Page 4, ma'am?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yes, sir.

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry, what tab was that on page 4?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: 21 of the thin notebook. You have stated several times that hydrogen peroxide and the oxygen therapy that you were doing was really quite safe. Are you aware of these studies here and I'll just read out a few, Hydrogen Peroxide, a source of Lethal Oxygen Embolism, Case Review -- Report and Review of the Literature in the American Journal Forensic Medical Oncology and we want to skip the one -- the quackery one that you talked about.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Cerebral Infarction Immediately after Ingestion of Hydrogen Peroxide, FDA Warns Consumers Against Drinking Hydrogen Peroxide and then Hydrogen Peroxide Poisoning. Are you familiar with all those?

WITNESS: Absolutely, ma'am. Most of my patients that
come in that are seeking this type of therapy have read many of these types of things about the recommendation on the Internet, which as I mentioned before are not reliable, and asking me their opinion and I tell them certainly not -- this is -- this is very unsafe.

The amount of hydrogen peroxide we're giving is the same amount of hydrogen peroxide that the macrophage within the system secretes. In fact, it's -- it's less than what the macrophage secrete when you take the whole system into account. This is how our own immune system works, so --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And it looks -- this is copyrighted down at the bottom and it looks like it was copyrighted down there by the Cancer Society.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, it does appear to be that. The American Cancer Society web site that I've been to is www.acs.org, so I just saw that just now, but I did not see that before.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Now, you stated several times that you thought prayer was very important and that prayer might change your Natural Killer Cell Activity and prayer definitely helps things.

How do you know with just looking at some of your patients
and the patient improvements that what we're seeing is
improvement not during the prayer -- not due to prayer?
How do you factor that out with your other variables?
WITNESS: Well, ma'am, I -- that's a great question and
I don't factor it out because I don't know. I think that
if I sat there and prayed for my patients and didn't treat
them, though, I don't think I would get the same response
rate in stimulating their immune system and detoxifying
them.
But I do believe that part of prayer is God as in all the
religions say that God helps those who help themselves,
so I put a little bit of prayer behind what I'm trying
to do and -- and hope for the best response for the patient.

But I -- I certainly am not going to not say the prayer
because it could be -- it could be giving me an edge and
I believe that even if it's an edge that I believe or the
patient believes or either way. It's not that we hold
hands and say prayer around our patients or anything like
that, but I pray for my patients and -- and I know that
my patients pray for me.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.
WITNESS: And part of that is also that I ask patients
to pray that -- that -- that I'm guided in whatever it is the best to help them get the optimum response. So it's not just a prayer with the patient but a prayer where -- the patient with me to make sure that I'm doing the best of my ability to help them.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. The next question I was going to ask you he already covered about that 40 percent of the cancer patients still alive today and you now say you misstated that.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. It's -- it's 40 percent of my patients have had cancer that are still alive today, yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Under --

WITNESS: Ma'am, that's -- that's just a rough estimate. I -- I -- you know, it could be a little bit more, it could be a little bit less. I'm just eye-balling it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. That is fine. On your consent form, that generic consent form, you had people consent to functional treatments and I was just curious, what is a functional treatment?

WITNESS: A functional treatment would be something that is seeking to improve a physiological function. For instance, giving somebody -- what would be a good example?
Giving somebody that has -- let's see, a function treatment would be somebody that has a gut abnormality as far as mobility is concerned and maybe they're not digesting or absorbing their food and giving them a high dose of glutathione orally which would help the function of the absorption of nutrients because that -- (inaudible) -- seems to be very high in glutathione or actually the same thing could be done  --  could be said about glutathione.

Glutathione as you know is an abundant antioxidant within every cell, but it's primarily found with that -- (inaudible) -- site. So if I give somebody glutathione, my goal is to up-regulate their P450 and Phase I/Phase II.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right. And I understand once you say that and I know that we've all been taught these things about chemistry.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: But in terms of randomized clinical trials looking at that, I don't think that you're going to find any evidence to support that.

WITNESS: I would probably concur with you, ma'am. It's been used pretty extensively throughout the world.
Glutathiones are given, you know, in many different forms, but I'm not familiar with any of those studies you're talking.

Although I do believe that there is more study being done now in the area of functional medicine. The Institute of Functional Medicine in Gate Harbor, Washington state, they have a number of studies that are going on right now.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. And then I was just a little curious too about the patient -- it's under Tab 11 and I can't remember if she was the ovarian or the cervical cancer.

MS. GODFREY: In whose book?


WITNESS: And, ma'am, if I --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Tab 11, your --

WITNESS: Tab 11, the big book?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah, the doctor's and Mr. Knox's book.

You had stated in your testimony that her jaundice wasn't addressed and yet his first sentence or the second sentence talks about jaundice and her elevated liver functions.

WITNESS: Sorry, ma'am, I haven't gotten to that point yet.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And I think that was --
MS. GODFREY: Tab 11.

WITNESS: This is -- Dr. Freedman's e-mail that we're --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yes, sir.

WITNESS: And what was the question, I'm sorry?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, I think it was more of an observation than a question. You had said that her liver -- you had said at one time her jaundice wasn't addressed at all and yet he talks about her elevated liver test.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. What I meant to say was and I thought that's what I said, is that her jaundice wasn't addressed, meaning that they didn't do anything to see if there was a mass effect causing compression of the biliary system or was it an obstruction. There was nothing that was done to address whether or not there was something that could be done, if she could have had a stent put in to maybe possibly help her and that's why I sent her to Dr. Clements to address it.

I didn't say that they didn't recognize it, I said they didn't do anything to address it. But, again, it's not -- it's not a criticism on their part, it was just --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. I was just -- because he -- he does say she has massive liver metastasis and that he didn't
think there was any further therapy, so --

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- I'm just taking that, you know --

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, I understand.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm not sure I understand that he didn't address it.

WITNESS: Ma'am, if I may make one comment regarding the question previous to that that you had asked me about the studies.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Uh-huh (yes).

WITNESS: One of the problems is -- and I think that, you know, one thing that I've learned in the last 17 years as a doctor is that 99.9 percent of doctors that I've come across truly want to do the best for their patients. But we have been trained, after our formal training, primarily by drug reps that come into our office. In fact, that's the reason I don't let a drug rep come into my office is because the reason that they're -- the reason that all these new drugs are being developed is because they're trying to patent something to make money on these drugs.

Things like glutathione or things like hydrogen peroxide
or EDTA that are either out of pattern or -- there's no way for anybody -- any pharmaceutical company to make money, they're not going to fund the randomized clinical trials.

It's -- I mean, the TAC trial took us, you know, 60 years. I fact, EDTA was indicated therapy for cardiovascular disease within the Physician's Desk Reference. It's been -- there's a whole chapter in Meserley's Textbook of Cardiology dedicated to EDTA. But once bypass was introduced, suddenly EDTA at this period from the Physician's Desk Reference leaving an indication for the removal of atheroma to help to reduce the lymphoperoxidation that's found within the atheroma.

My point being again that a lot of this funding of double-blinded placebo-controlled trials or multi-centered trials is motivated by the pharmaceutical companies to make big dollars. And if there's no profit potential for it, they don't have any incentive to do so.

So either my choice is to do something empirically based upon what my observations have been because my patients don't have another 20 years or 15 years or 30 years before these studies have been substantiated to show that, yes,
this is the better way.
So I have a choice that I have to make. Either it's, one, I do the best that I can for my patient based upon the empirical evidence making sure that I do no harm; or two, to resort to the same model of medicine that was making me question whether I really deserve this type of personal agony that I was creating for myself by being in this profession that I didn't feel like I was helping people.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: And there again there are plenty of opportunities for research, there are plenty of recognized trials. You can do IRBs. There are some private IRB organizations.
WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. Before you --
PRESIDENT RHYNE: I think what our point is, is that we're scientists.
WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- and we ought to prove something. We don't like to just say that there's no inherent proof that we don't -- impericism has it's place in some forms.
    We like proof that something works.
WITNESS: I'm --
PRESIDENT RHYNE: And objective evidence is the best sign of that.
WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. I am one of the TAC trial investigators and we participate in as much as we can whenever there's an opportunity to do so.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Do you send -- do you send notes to referred doctors, cardiologists, oncologist? I hadn't seen in your charts and yet I've seen you have plenty of notes from cardiologists and oncologists where they -- they've sent copies to their doctors. And as you and I both know that communication between physicians is very, very important and I can't tell from your notes that you've had any communication.

WITNESS: As you can see, ma'am, there's notes in there from other doctors back to us from like Dr. Clements and from some of the other doctors, Dr. Holbert and such. But usually --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right, but I didn't see yours going the other way?

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. And that's because I usually pick up the phone and I call them and I talk to them and then on this document, talked with so and so, but I have not. This is -- it's a logistical issue and we're going to electronic medical records so that we can actually have more of -- more of method of how -- what the discussion
was with the doctor.

But usually I'll talk to them on the phone and when I send
the patient I'll take our stuff and make a copy and give
it to the patient, so the doctor has everything rather
than having one letter that I send to the doctor that's
included in the chart. I have not done that in the past.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And do you document in your chart that
you talked to the doctor?

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, it is documented in the chart.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Where was that at? I guess I'm just

--

WITNESS: And which -- which patient would you like for
me to --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, any of them. I didn't see it on
any of them.

WITNESS: We can start with the first one, ma'am, if you
would like and work our way down.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: If you can just show me one, I would
be happy.

WITNESS: Sure. In Patient --

MR. KNOX: A.

WITNESS: -- Patient A, okay.

MS. GODFREY: That's 9 in our notebook.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Tab -- tab 9?

WITNESS: And there's -- and often, ma'am, I will just ask one of my staffs to make the note while I'm talking to them, but on 8/8/06 on C5 that I -- myself and my nurse practitioner or by the RN, discussed the patient and I called Dr. Clements and arranged for her to see him.

On 8/15 on page -- it's C7B, discussed with Dr. Holbert in detail. And I think these are the only two times for this patient that I sent them.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You had mentioned Patient B that you discharged her from your practice.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, because -- yes, ma'am, I did.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Did -- and how did you do that?

WITNESS: It's --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Is there a letter or --

WITNESS: Yes -- well, there's a final note and then my nurse practitioner, Ms. Garcia, called Dr. Holbert and told her that we were discharging her from the patient -- from our -- as a patient. And we sent -- I believe we sent her records to Dr. Holbert or --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Did you arrange for care for her?

WITNESS: Oh, yes, ma'am, we didn't -- we didn't desert
her. Of course we -- you know, we can -- we have a policy that for 30 days unless there's something else going on, but for 30 days, ma'am, we'll still continue to help the patient as much as we possibly can, but we won't administered any more IV therapies or do any types of treatments, just if there's any type of -- you know, when the patient doesn't have any continuity care, but she was referred back to an -- from the last note from Ms. Garcia indicates that. I can show you that if you like.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. And do you sell vitamins from the office for people to take home? I know you give the vitamin infusions. Do you actually sell them in the office also?

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, I do. Yes, ma'am. And that's where that letter that -- or the document from the North Carolina Medical Board that we got that --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

WITNESS: -- that they have a choice in --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. That's all I have.

MR. JIMISON: I have nothing.

WITNESS: The biggest reason we do that, ma'am, is, one,
is for quality, but the biggest reason is for convenience because the patients can get it while they're there in our office. And usually the cost of what they're going to pay us is less than what they would have paid at an GNC. Or just like the protein powder, I think it's $76, that's actually two pounds so that's four pounds and that's a coal filter whey isolate protein and the same protein or the same -- if you want to call it the same quality, it's not the same quality because it's not whey, it's not concentrated as the way I sell it -- whey isolate that we're using for the same four pounds it's over $180 at GNC.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

WITNESS: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Dr. McCulloch?

DR. McCULLOCH: Just one more question.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: The first person that, I can't say her name, I can't remember.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No.

WITNESS: One of the patients, sir, you're talking about?

DR. McCULLOCH: The wife of the patient --

WITNESS: Oh, yes, sir.
DR. McCULLOCH: -- with adrenal cancer.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. McCULLOCH: It's Kenny.

WITNESS: Ms. Kenny.

DR. McCULLOCH: Yeah, I knew it, I just didn't know if I could say it.

She testified that you told them that you could treat his cancer with 100 percent success rate. And -- and I would just like to hear you respond to that. Why do you think she would have said that if --

WITNESS: I can't tell you -- I'm sorry, sir, go ahead.

DR. McCULLOCH: -- if you didn't say that?

WITNESS: Sir, I've never seen that woman in my life. I've never seen that woman and I document in my chart, if I have a patient that there with a family member, I always document it. Any charts that you pull from me, if it's a patient from out of state, I put down what state or what country they're from and then I put down who accompanied them.

And you'll notice in this chart, it doesn't say anything about any family member. And when I was asked if I had seen her, I said I've never seen and then I was told that she said seen me once. And I said, well, if she says that,
then so be it. I didn't have any reason to doubt her. However, I talked to four members of my staff that worked with me -- that worked for me at that time that still continue to work for me and all four of them have said that they've never seen her. She's never been to our clinic. If she has been to the clinic, I certainly did not see here. She certainly never sat in on the first consultation with XXX.

I had a very close relationship with Mr. Kenny. He was very difficult. A lot of our staff members when we found out what happened, but he never talked about his wife. We always talked about his kids. There was never a mention about his wife. All I know is that on a few occasion walked into the examine room screaming on the phone, he apologized to me and shut the phone and that's all I can tell you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Board Members, do you have anything else? Thank you very much.

WITNESS: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead with your next witness.

MR. KNOX: This is the deposition of Mr. Hewitt.

(DISCUSSION OFF RECORD)
(WHEREUPON, THE VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION
OF WILLIAM JOHN HEWITT TAKEN ON APRIL 9, 2008
WAS PLAYED AND IS HEREBY ATTACHED
IN ITS ENTIRETY AS EXHIBIT 47)

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  Mr. Knox or Ms. Godfrey, how many more witnesses do you have?
MR. KNOX:  Well, we have one short tape and I mean it's --

MS. GODFREY:  Twenty minutes.
MR. KNOX:  -- it's 20 minutes. That one went a lot longer than thought. But, anyway, then we have two independent witnesses.
PRESIDENT RHYNE:  Okay. And they're new -- it's new material because this tape was a lot of the same stuff that occurred.
MR. KNOX:  Well, one of them is a cancer patient. I have a series of affidavits in your book -- our book. The one I particularly ask you to read, I want you to look at all of them, but look Dr. Lintala who is a gentleman who was supposed to be on-call for us to talk to him and I'm willing to go pass that, but if I could put those affidavits in.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right. Why don't we take about a ten-minute break and then we'll come back and watch that other video. Everybody is talking about they want to have a break. Dr. Buttar is walking around the room.

MR. KNOX: But before do that, if I -- if I may, just the gentleman that's on the -- he gave an affidavit and it is in your book and we offer that as evidence. It's number 39, is a copy of that. I think it speaks pretty much to what he said, but I'd like to say she was the first one to be treated by him.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. JIMISON: Now, there is one way we could -- I mean, the next videotape is just 20 minutes long. I think there is a transcript of it and we could just have the transcript entered into evidence of that instead of watching the videotape.

MR. KNOX: That's not -- I will do anything to accommodate you, but we took -- we've already waived one deposition that we took and this is an important person --

MR. JIMISON: Well, watch the videotape. Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We'll watch the video.

(3:27 P.M. - 3:38 P.M. RECESS)
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Please proceed, Mr. Knox?

MR. KNOX: The affidavit of Dr. Alan Lintala who I indicated earlier, it's in Exhibit 36 and he was scheduled to be a telephone witness and there's affidavits -- and we can give everybody copies of these.

There's an affidavit of Rosi Arrondo and Number 39, affidavit of Hewitt, that I just told you about. And there is an affidavit Anne Phelps. Yeah, they were here yesterday and so were the Hewitts. An affidavit of both Anne and Joe Phelps, 41 and 42.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right.

MR. KNOX: We gave you an executed copy of Michelle Reed that was supposed to have been on the phone this morning and that completes the affidavits.

And we mentioned this to you, the transcript -- the video transcript we did of Frances Allen because he was duplicative to Mr. Jarrett, I did not show that.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. KNOX: But that affidavit -- that transcript will be introduced and I'm trying to do all I can to save as much time as I can. We can give these to Madam Court Reporter.

MS. GODFREY: While we're -- while we're waiting on that,
Dr. Buttar also asked -- I'm sorry, I didn't mean to stand up.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go right ahead.

MS. GODFREY: It's kind of a habit.

Dr. Buttar also asked could I hand up some additional articles. I'll go ahead and hand them to Marcus. I believe one of them you have already, the -- the one from the proceedings of the National Academy of Science. I think you used it in Dr. Ripoll's deposition and this is the role of hydrogen peroxide and hydroradical formation killing early tumor cells in the body -- anticancer. There's also some articles dealing with ozone relating to the 8th Annual Ozone World Congress in Zurich, Switzerland, ozone in medicine over your future directions, ozone therapy for tumor, oxygenation of pilot studies.

And some articles on oxygen hemostasis.

Lastly, an article published in Lung Cancer by the Department of Oncology at the Mayo Clinic, is voluntary vitamin and mineral supplementation associated with their outcome in non-small cell lung cancer patients. And Dr. Buttar would want to -- wants to submit these to the Board for their consideration.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

MR. JIMISON: And in that vein, I don't have the --

MS. GODFREY: And the New England Journal of Medicine abstract is in -- in our exhibits already, but I'll hand this up. And that had to do with hydrogen peroxide and the -- I'm losing my words -- it's -- it had to do with hydrogen peroxide in increasing the efficacy of chemotherapy.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

MR. JIMISON: In that -- Dr. Rhyne, in that same vein, just for housekeeping and the court reporter, if the Board can go ahead and introduce Exhibits 18, 19, 20 and 21, and I believe you have the copy of Dr. Buttar's e-mail which will be 25. We can go ahead -- if we can go ahead and put those into evidence as well.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. That's fine.

MS. GODFREY: There's one thing I would like to do and, again, for housekeeping purposes with the court reporter, if I could get our exhibit list -- where's our exhibit list?

MS. GEMZA: I've got it right here.

MS. GODFREY: I have a list in the front of our exhibit book and I do a little check off as how I try to keep track
of it. And you see my chart, it's in the table of contents?

I would just like to check off with the court reporter
the ones that I believe were received into evidence.

MR. JIMISON: Well, it might be faster if you do the ones
that are not admitted.

MS. GODFREY: Well -- well, there might be -- let's tender
these for the record. Exhibit --

MR. JIMISON: Well --

MS. GODFREY: Exhibit 1, which is the CV of Dr. Buttar.

Exhibit 2, we --

MR. JIMISON: We could do --

MS. GODFREY: -- Nurse Garcia is yet to testify.

MR. JIMISON: That's fine, you can go ahead.

MS. GODFREY: Number 3 is the correspondence from David
Henderson. Again --

MR. JIMISON: There are only a few that I have an objection.

Number 3 right now is the only one I have an objection
to.

MS. GODFREY: Okay. Number -- I will tender it for the
record whether or not the Board decides to consider it
or not is -- it is certainly up to you, but I will tender
Number 3 for the record, correspondence from Mr. Henderson.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.
MS. GODFREY: Number 4, correspondence to Thomas -- Thomas Mansfield.
Number 5, Collaborative Practice Agreement.
Number 6, Patient A Consent Forms.
Number 7, a letter from John Clements.
Number 8, review sheets from Dr. John Peterson.
Number 9, progress notes for Patient A.
Number 10, IRR sheets for Patient A.
Number 11, it's a note from M.D. Anderson Cancer Center on Patient A.
Number 12, Patient B Consent Forms.
Number 13, progress notes on Patient B.
Number 14, Patient B lab work.
Number 15, a medical dictionary that Patient B gave to Dr. Buttar.
Number 16, the estate file of Patient B.
Number 17, the Consent Forms for Patient C.
Number 18, the progress notes for Patient C.
Number 19, the blood work on cancer for Patient C.
Number 20, Patient C's medical records and prior CT scans.
Number 21, Patient C's past treatment record.
Number 22, Patient D Consent Forms.
Number 23, Patient D's progress notes.
Number 24, Patient D urine toxic metal labs.
Number 25, Patient D's -- those actually will be covered in Nurse Garcia's testimony.
Number 26, Costs of selected IVs.
Number 27, sign from the waiting room.
Number 28, we have a witness for that.
Number 29, CV of John Wilson, M.D.
(COURT REPORTER'S NOTE - Number 30 omitted)
Number 31, CV of Emilia Ripoll, M.D.
Number 32, e-mail from Patient E's mother.
Number 33, Patient C's death certificate.
Number 34, the abstract from the New England Journal of Medicine.
Number 35, CV of John Peterson.
I believe that Mr. Knox just moved into evidence the affidavits 36 through 42; is that right?
PRESIDENT RHYNE: He did. He did.
MS. GODFREY: Okay. And we have the transcripts of the patients 43 through 47 that testified on video deposition.
We have one yet to hear and that will be Number 44.
Number 48, the transcript of Dr. Ripoll.
49, the subpoena to Stephanie Kenny.

Number 50, let's see, let me -- we have not -- we have not referred Exhibit 50. It's the transcript of Patient D. I'm not sure we're going to --

MR. JIMISON: I will be objecting to that. That's a patient who has not testified and that would be just a discovery deposition. There is -- that's just -- discovery depositions are when counsel on the other side is to ask questions of the witness. There's just really no rules and she hasn't testified and so therefore there would be no cause for that exhibit.

MS. GODFREY: I believe under Rules of Civil Procedure, we can read a party deponent's deposition into evidence. And Patient B is a complaining -- was one of the complaining witnesses in the case and I believe that makes her a party deponent.

MR. JIMISON: She -- she's -- I'm sorry.

MR. KNOX: I don't think that's --

MR. JIMISON: She's not a party in --

MR. KNOX: I think we've already agreed that that's -- that she's no longer a party in the case.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: Okay. There were some transcripts -- some
other discovery transcripts that I think were just used as cross-examination. Exhibit 55 is one that I would just like to move into evidence. It is a summary exhibit and it was previously furnished to the Medical Board. What we did and this came in quite late, but we did get a list of the medical charges for Patient B at Forsyth Regional Cancer Center. And I just -- what we did is go through and add up the total amount of charges that Patient B incurred before she went to Dr. Buttar and I move that into evidence.

Like I said, those records were subpoenaed by the Board, they -- and -- and we went through and added up and provided this to Mr. Jimison as a summary exhibit because quite frankly the medical bill was that thick. And so rather than put that into evidence, we -- we did it this way just as a point of reference to the amount that was spent in Patient B's cancer treatment prior to her coming to Dr. Buttar.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: That's fine. We'll accept those that we agreed on.

MR. JIMISON: And one last brief piece of housekeeping, because a lot of these documents have specific patient information and they're very voluminous to have to be...
redacted, I would like to move that they be kept under seal and that if there's a public request for them, that we will make them public, but only after we inspect them and make sure all the redactions were complete. So I wanted to keep these from errors, you know, because sometimes you don't redact everything. It's just so many documents and so we can --

MS. GODFREY: We did our very best to redact everything in the exhibits that we presented.

MR. JIMISON: I can't guarantee that we got everything. I'm not sure they can guarantee they got everything, but just keep under seal --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: That's -- that's fine.

MS. GODFREY: Until when?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Until --

MR. JIMISON: Until there's a public request. I mean, it's just a government -- if there's a public request for the exhibits, then we would provide the exhibits, you know, as part of the public request, but only at the time we've had the time to inspect the documents and make sure they were completely redacted.

MS. GODFREY: Okay.

COURT REPORTER: Now, I still have a question. I'm still
uncertain about Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 50. I could take
out of this book and give back to you; and Exhibit 3, I'm
not sure of that.

MR. KNOX: Well, actually Exhibit 3 was the letter, right?
REPORTER: Right.

MR. JIMISON: The tendered letter, but that was the
non-public letter.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah.

MR. KNOX: Well, it's tendered for the record, so you would
want to keep a copy of it for the transcription even though
she knew not to consider it.

MR. JIMISON: Yeah, I don't --

MR. KNOX: There's no other way to do it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'm sorry, you're going to have to tell
me what tendered means.

MR. KNOX: Well, we tendered a letter by one of the people
with the Medical Board.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right, I know what --

MR. KNOX: Tender means we handed up to you and he objected
to it and you said, well, I'm not going to let that in.

We want to put that in the record for subsequent hearings
if there are any that -- and if it's right or wrong. It's
not personal, but it's that we want to consider that.
MR. JIMISON: That's fine.

MR. KNOX: It's showing prejudice if nothing else.

MR. JIMISON: That's fine. We're fine with that.

MR. KNOX: That's the short version of it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MR. KNOX: We're not quite as authoritative --

MR. JIMISON: And just one last thing, Dr. Rhyne. Mr. Mansfield will be co-counseling during rebuttal. If there's a rebuttal we're planning on calling Dr. Buttar back to the stand for a quick rebuttal and Mr. Mansfield will be doing the examination and I just want to give everybody a heads up so at least after their last witness we have at least one more witness which will be Dr. Buttar that we will call back in rebuttal.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. And then I think 50 we just said -- we all decided would --

MS. GODFREY: We all decided that 50 was not going to come in.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah --

MS. GODFREY: No, that's --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- that's the one you agreed --

MS. GODFREY: -- deposition of Patient D. Well, we're tender it for the record.
MR. KNOX: Yeah.

MS. GODFREY: Well, the record will note that it's not admitted into evidence and we'll tender it for the record.

MR. JIMISON: Fine.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

MR. KNOX: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right. I think we're ready to go and you had can call your next witness.

MR. KNOX: Okay, yeah. Nina Wall, will you come around please and be sworn?

WHEREUPON,

NINA NEWTON WALL,

being first duly sworn,

was examined and testified

as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

QWould you tell the Board your name, please?

AMy name is Nina Newton Wall.

QAnd where do you live?

AMooresville, North Carolina.

QAnd are you married?
AYes.

QWould you just tell them your educational background?

AI have a Bachelor of Science degree in Health Education and

a music degree. I have been certified in chelation therapy

and --

QAnd how long have you worked at Advanced Concepts with Dr. Buttar?

APFor more than eight years.

QOkay. And y'all were in Cornelius, correct?

AYes.

QAnd the office is now down in Huntersville?

AYes.

QOkay. And would you just tell them generally what your job

is and what you do?

AWell, I'm employed as an IV tech. I also work in the

biofeedback and hyperbarics. I do EKGs for mass density.

A little bit of anything that needs to be done.

QAnd in the course of your work you are watching Dr. Buttar

in is practice quite obviously?

AYes.

QAnd what is -- what is his demeanor with his patients and things

of that nature?

AWell, he's one of the most -- most kind people I've ever met.
He's very concerned about his patients. He tries very hard to -- to make sure they understand where he stands on things and he wants very much for them to understand that he's there to help them help themselves -- help their body to help itself. He's very quick to let them know that he's not the Almighty.

Q And are you trained in some type of therapy of things that you do practice there at the clinic?

A Yes.

Q And what training have you had?

A I have had extensive training in biofeedback, advanced classes in that. I'm certified in chelation therapy and have been since 1991 -- I think it's '91 and have gone through some hyperbaric training.

Q Okay. Just briefly, do you know Patient A? If Patient A came to the clinic, did you get to see her?

A I'm sorry, I'm not sure who is --

Q Patient A is a lady from --

MS. GODFREY: With cervical cancer.

Q -- cervical cancer, the daughter that she had testified to --

A Yes.

Q And do you remember her daughter coming into the clinic?
AYes, I do.

QAnd in the course of their time that they spent there, was there any dissatisfaction ever expressed by anybody about the daughter's treatment?

ANo, not at all.

QWould you -- would you do some of the therapy on those patients?

AYes, I did.

QAnd can you just express one way or the other her either interest in continuing the therapy or not?

AThe daughter or the mother?

QLet's take the mother first and the daughter next.

AThe mother was very determined to do whatever was necessary to prolong her life and make it as viable and enjoyable for however long. The daughter stood by her for every step of that.

QNo complaints by the two of them, ever?

ANot to me.

QHow about Patient B, the lady that was there for several weeks that had the ovarian cancer?

AShe was a very quiet lady. She was just sweet and kind. I heard her talk a great deal about her -- her daughter or her son. I can't remember if it was the daughter or son, but it was some years ago. But she did talk about how
much she loved her children.

I don't remember her talking very much about a nephew who
seemed to be really -- I mean, she may have, I just don't
remember at this time.

Q Were there any complaints about -- from her or her boyfriend
about the treatment that you were all giving?
A No, sir, not that I remember.

Q Patient C, the only one you had to deal with. Patient C is
the patient that had adrenal cancer, right?
A Yes.

Q Now, do you remember when he first came there as a patient?
Did you meet him?
A Yes.

Q Do you remember whether or not his wife, the lady that was
here who testified, was she present with him?
A No, sir, not to my knowledge. I've never seen her come in.
I'm sure we would --

Q And so the times that she -- can you hear her? Sorry.

President Rhyne: I didn't hear the last sentence.

A I'm sorry. Not to my knowledge can I ever remember seeing
her come in.

Q So you don't know whether she did or not, but you don't remember
seeing her?
A No, I do not.

Q The patient had what kind of relationship with the staff?

A He had a very close relationship with us. There was many mornings that when we would drive up and lots of times I was the first person there and the last one to leave, he would be in the parking lot waiting -- waiting for somebody to be there. Granted, it was kind of nice because sometimes it was dark, so I was glad to have somebody there.

I'd go, come on in and sit down, you know, we've got to everything going. He said, oh, that's all right. Can I just, you know, come back and talk and visit. He just wanted to visit. He just wanted -- very quickly we became more than just a doctor's office to him. We were his comfort zone. He didn't like to leave. Many times he would be through with treatments early in the afternoon, but he would wait and just walk out with us and leave. He was a musician, too.

Q By the way, he lived in Matthews. How far is Matthews from Cornelius?

A I guess it's about an hour.

Q Okay. And have you ever been to Matthews down 485 to Cornelius?

A No.
Q: Is there any way to go up 485 and go to Cornelius?
A: Not that I know.
Q: Oh, there's not. Well, actually 485 runs into Statesville Road and stops there, doesn't it?
A: Correct.
Q: Okay. The times that you spent with him going over his treatment did you feel like he was improving?
A: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely.
Q: What was your observations about the improvements, if any, you made? Go ahead.
A: During the time that he was there we saw him almost blossom. When he came in -- I can remember vividly him coming in and the reason I can remember this is because I quickly found out that he was musician and a drummer and I always wanted to play the drums. So we struck up this conversation, but --
Q: And you play -- you play the piano, don't you?
A: I play the piano and organ, yes. And our conversations were so -- just good. He even wanted to teach me how to play drums, he wanted me to help him with some music that he was wanting to write, but he seemed so weak.
And I remember making the comment to him that, well, you know, we're going to have to get you a little stronger
before we start trying to do all this, but it's good to make plans. It gives us another goal.

So, yes, he -- he started to thrive.

He brought in a piece of poetry that he had written and he said, here, read this and come up with some music for it.

And I said, okay. When you get to the point that you start teaching me to play drums, I'll write your music.

And he worked really hard that before long he was thriving and he would even bounce in the office and tell me about something that he had come up with music-wise or he would say, I feel okay today, but, yet, he still had -- some energy was not there.

Q Did he write this Postcard from Heaven and give it to you?
A He did. That was --

Q That's in --
A That was the piece that he wanted me to write music to.

Q It's the last page of Exhibit 28.

So you had continuous contact with him. Now, toward the end of his treatment, do you know if there was any discussion about him going somewhere else for therapy?

A I was not personally involved with a great deal of that. He did say that he -- he liked being with us, he was comfortable
with us, felt safe with us; however, he respected whatever
Dr. Buttar's recommendation was going to be.

Q I show that there's a series of e-mails from apparently to
you. What is -- if you would look at these and tell me
if they're yours that you received and who they were
received from.

MS. GODFREY: This is Exhibit 28, the first part of the
exhibit notebook.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

AYes. These are e-mails that -- that he had written to me
because when he -- actually, it was the last day that he
was in our office before he left to go to Mexico for
treatment, I was on vacation, so we didn't get to actually,
you know, say good-bye and wish each other well.
But I was so concerned that he was in a foreign country
by himself that I kept e-mailing him just to let him know
that we were not just still there for him, but we were
still part of the team.

Q And did he always respond to you?
AYes.

Q Was there anything negative that you recall that this patient
said to you or any other employee that the treatment there
was erroneous or there was a guarantee, or anything of
that nature?

A Never.

Q Now, you know that a payment -- a check was stopped by his wife that he paid? Do you know that or not?

A No, sir. I'm not involved in any facet of the money portions of the office.

Q And you're satisfied that the time that he spent there not only helped him, but also he was happy with it; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Were there times that he would be on the phone that you could hear somebody screaming at him?

A Yes, there was.

Q Do you know who it was?

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q Who --

A On several occasions, I don't know how often.

Q Who did he say it was?

A Many times he would be very upset and just slam the phone and say something about his wife.

Q So he was under distress with the cancers and marital stress, as far as you knew?

A Yes.
MR. KNOX: All right. That's it.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

QMs. Wall, do you know Patient C's wife?
A No, sir, I do not.
Q Do you have any idea whether she is a grieving mother or not?
A No, I do not. I have no knowledge.
Q And when Patient C passed away he left three children behind?
A I do know that.
Q All right. He left his wife?
A Certainly.
Q And -- and you've never been a visitor to their household?
A No.

MR. JIMISON: That's all I have.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Do any Board Members have any questions of this witness? I have one.

EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

PRESIDENT RHYNE: You said that you're certified in chelation therapy. What did -- what did you do to obtain that certification?
WITNESS: There is an International Society of Chelation Therapy Technicians and I went through their course.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right. All right, thank you.
MR. KNOX: Let me ask one question.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KNOX:

Q: Did you go to the funeral -- did a number of some of the employees at the clinic go the funeral?

A: No, I did not. I was out of town.

Q: I'm sorry, I misread that. Thank you.

MR. KNOX: We have that other video ready and then we'll have one other witness.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right.

(WHEREUPON, THE VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF ELLEN HINSHAW TAKEN ON APRIL 20, 2008 WAS PLAYED AND IS HEREBY ATTACHED IN ITS ENTIRETY AS EXHIBIT 44)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: We're ready to continue. Ms. Godfrey, do you have another witness?

MS. GODFREY: Yes, we have Jane Garcia. Ms. Garcia, please come be sworn.

WHEREUPON,

JANE GARCIA,

being first duly sworn,

was examined and testified
as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:

QCould you state your name for the record, please?
AJane Garcia.
QAnd, Ms. Garcia, I'm going to be using the notebook that's to your left there, the big one there. And if you could turn to Exhibit 2 in that notebook, is that the copy of your CV?
AYes, it is.
QOkay. And are you -- where are you currently employed?
AOVER at Advanced Concepts in Medicine with Dr. Buttar.
QHow long have you worked there?
ASince September of '03.
QAnd what is your training?
AMy training is -- from the very beginning?
QFrom -- from post-high school, yes.
AOKay. I'm a registered nurse. I attended the first associate degree program at Central Piedmont College at Charlotte Memorial Hospital in 1965 and 1967, so that that makes me an old nurse, so to speak.
And then I went to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in 1979 and '80 because AGW gave a grant to
them for three one-year tracks in occupation -- for
occupational nurse practitioners. At that time I worked
for Burlington Industries when Burlington Industries was
an important factor in textiles in the state of North
Carolina. And there were probably like 120 occupational
health nurses and I received a degree from this program.
QAnd did you obtain a degree in the nurse practitioner's program?
AYes, I did.
QAnd what is the nature of that degree?
AThe nature of the degree is occupational health. And when
I sat for my certification there was no other
certifications other than being a certified patient health
nurse. For a practitioner, I saw for the national
certification for nurse practitioners.
QAnd when did you sit for that certification?
A1981 and 1982 because at that time I transferred to Mississippi
with Burlington Industries and it was a requirement in
the state of Mississippi to be nationally certified. At
that time it wasn't a requirement in North Carolina.
QAnd did you continue to work in the occupational health field?
AI did for a short time and then my former husband was in law
school in Michigan and I went to Michigan and I worked
with Ingham Otolaryngology.
Q: And how long did you work with the --
A: For about a year. For about a year.
Q: And that was from '82 to '83?
A: Yes, it is.
Q: And following -- following that --
A: Following that we moved to south Florida for my husband's law practice and I started to work for a medical management company that were emergency physicians. At that time, it was a private group and then it became a public group and then -- which was under the name Impotent Medical Management. And then we were sold and it became American Services Group. But during that time, I spent 20 years with that company, both private and public.
Q: Okay. And during that 20 year period and I guess that's from '83 --
A: '83 --
Q: -- to -- to 2002?
A: Yes.
Q: What positions did you hold with the company -- with the medical management company?
A: Okay. Initially I worked as a nurse practitioner with a collaborative relationship, was hospital based internists.
At that time, I don't know if you remember there was an HMO in South Carolina which was called Gold Plus and it later became Humana. It was for -- I can't recall the first name, but then it became Humana. And at that time, that was a hospital where they referred all there patients from their HMO clinics. And our company had been hired to set up a group of nurse practitioners and hospital based internists to do the hospital folks inside that took care of their patients from the HMO.

Q And then did you advance through the -- through the company until -- what was your position in 2000 -- in 1998 to 2001?

A I'll do that, but can I also add something there, that I forgot to add the first time?

Q I was going to ask you about the -- that. I'm sorry.

A The oncology.

Q Okay, I'm sorry.

A Yeah. During that time in the hospital, I worked as a -- in the hospital and we also worked with oncologists and they wanted to have an oncology nurse practitioner. Of course, I was not trained as an oncology nurse practitioner, but they had worked with me and they said we want to train you. So I went to the University of South Florida and took some courses in oncology and I worked with those
oncologists.

Q And that was 1983 to 1987?
AYeah, '87, yes.

Q Then did you advance through the company to --
AYes, I did.

Q -- okay, of an administrative position?
AYes. I became the manager of physician recruitment for the physicians.

Q Okay. Now, during the period starting 1987 through the time that you left the medical management company, how did you maintain your clinical skills?

AWell, we also had the contract with the Broward County Sexual Assault Treatment Center. Prior to that, gynecologists were doing the rape exams and the nurse practitioners -- we got that contract and we started doing the rape exams. And I kept very active in doing rape exams throughout that time.

Q And -- and on estimate, how many hours a week would you work at --
A At least eight hours. I always did at least eight hours to keep my certification.

And also during this time, I was director of nurses for a military services contract. That's the time there was
privatization with the military bases, primarily the Navy, to bring in outside physicians and groups to manage their emergency departments and their -- their clinics. And we set up an employee based certification that was required more for physicians and for -- well, initial blood work and that sort of thing and I oversaw that.

Q: And that was part of your clinical --

A: Right. All of that work came into my office, yes.

Q: Now, in 2002 or 2003 did you leave south Florida?

A: Yes, I did.

Q: And where did you move to?

A: I moved back here to North Carolina.

Q: And since 2003 where have you been employed?

A: I've worked with Dr. Buttar.

Q: And what's been your position with Dr. Buttar?

A: I've been a nurse practitioner.

Q: And as a nurse practitioner how did you become familiar with integrative medicine?

A: Everything I know about integrative medicine, Dr. Buttar has taught me, except for one thing that I would say I did integrative medicine for myself.

When I became that age of maturity where people thought that you needed to be on hormones when you're going through
menopause and that sort of thing, I did not go the
traditional route. There was an integrative medicine book
that I read and I treated myself at that regard by not
doing that type of thing. But everything else that I know
of integrative medicine Dr. Buttar has taught me.
Q And do you have with Dr. Buttar a Collaborative Practice
Agreement?
A Yes, I do.
Q And I believe that's our Exhibit 5; is that correct? That
was identified in Dr. Buttar's testimony.
A Yes, uh-huh (yes).
Q And do you and Dr. Buttar update that Collaborative Practice
Agreement on a yearly basis?
A Well, we review it and update it if it needs to be, yes.
Q And what is the scope of practice that you have under your
agreement with Dr. Buttar?
A Well, my scope of practice is really under the agreement of
the North Carolina Board of Nursing and with the Medical
Board as -- because I am certified as a nurse practitioner.
Q Okay.
A However, in our practice, we treat heavy metal toxicity and
I follow that protocol for adults and children. I do not
treat children for private care or well baby checks or
anything in that regard. The same as when I worked the otolaryngologist. He had had a family nurse practitioner who did not work out, but because he had not trained that person to look at the ear as a specialist would, but he did train me in that regard and I did see children and adolescence before he did surgery on them and then afterwards.

Because in nurse practitioner training I was taught if you don't know the answer, you don't -- (inaudible) -- and if you work with a physician in a collaborative practice, you can be taught by that physician.

Q And does your Collaborative Practice Agreement list the types of drugs and devices that you --

A Yes.

Q -- can prescribe?

A Yes.

Q And do you -- do you in your practice with Dr. Buttar stay within those limits?

A Yes. I do not prescribe controlled drugs. I could get a DEA, but I chose not to, so that is not in my scope of practice.

Q Describe your working relationship with Dr. Buttar.

A Okay. My working relationship with Dr. Buttar is this. When I work with a physician, I have to believe in what they're
doing. And when I came to work with him, initially we had a love-hate relationship and that doesn't mean bad that it was a love-hate relationship in that regard. It was just that when he was in the room seeing a patient and we were on a schedule, you know, I tried to stay on schedule. And one thing that I liked about our practice is I have been an administrator in a medical management company and even set up guidelines that our PAs and nurse practitioners and physicians in other clinics should see so many patients an hour.

In our practice with Dr. Buttar, we schedule at least one hour for a patient visit and that to me is very good because we have the time to sit down and really listen to the patient. I think a lot of times in healthcare we don't listen to patients. We go in with an idea of a cookbook or whatever, they tell us one thing and then we write a prescription and that's what we do. Sometimes I would get aggravated with him if we have a patient and we're supposed to see another patient in an hour, we might be in there for two hours. And that's what I meant because I'm a pretty rigid person and if I've got an appointment in hour, I make sure I see that.

Q Did you and Dr. Buttar work out that problem --
AYes, we did.
Q-- between you?
AYes, we did.

QAnd as you progressed in his practice, did you begin to see patients on your own --
AYes
Q-- and not just with Dr. Buttar?
AYes, yes.
QAnd is that the way you practice today?
AYes, yes.

QIn your experience with Dr. Buttar, does he review your charts on a regular basis?
AYes, he does and we have a weekly meeting that we review the patients that I have seen for that week. If I needed him for, you know, a consultation or if I was having a question or needed him with a patient, I could see him any of that time or call him.

But as my understanding as a nurse practitioner, that's why there were nurse practitioner programs that nurse practitioners and PAs are extenders of those physicians and the physician doesn't have to see the patient every time the nurse practitioner does or co-sign the chart every time the nurse practitioner sees a patient other than that
first six months when they're working with a new provider.
QAnd in your -- in your experience, is there any limit on the
types of patients that you see or do you see all patients
in the practice?
AI see all patients in the practice.
QAnd is there any patient that you don't intake?
ANo.
QAnd so you've worked both with cancer patients and other
patients in --
AYes, yes.
QWell, I'm going to direct your attention to Patient A and ask
you to turn to Exhibit 9 in the book. Did you do the intake
on Patient A?
AYes, I did.
QAnd just -- we've been through the medical records. What I'd
like you to do though is tell -- tell the Board your
recollections of Patient A and what you understood about
her situation on this patient when you first met her.
AWell, when the patient came initially she came with her daughter
and her husband. And this -- this lady was 49 years old
and her daughter is in her 20s. And you could tell they
were a very close knit family and this was a horrible time
for them. And they were a very concerned family and wanted
to do whatever they could do and I know that this lady had a strong will to live.

Q And after you did the intake on -- on Patient A, did you consult with Dr. Buttar?

A Yes, I did.

Q And was a treatment plan developed for Patient A?

A Yes.

Q And did that involve some -- some testing?

A Yes, it did.

Q What kind of testing did Dr. Buttar order to develop a treatment plan on this patient?

A Well, normally when I see a new patient, we do the initial visit which is the consult to review their history and to ask them of any history or anything that they bring with them. And then we go to develop a plan. Before we start treatment, there's initial blood work that we do. There is initial testing that we do to look at the GI tract -- (inaudible) -- analysis. We do a physical and we do an EKG.

Q And as a result of those tests, was a treatment plan determined for this patient?

A Yes.
Q: And -- and what the treatment plan?
A: Okay. We have an established treatment plan which is to help to build up the immune system in cancer patients.

Q: And is that implemented --
A: And it's a guideline. It doesn't mean that this patient gets this -- this much. We have a treatment plan to detoxify the body and to treat the patient.

Q: And is that what was implemented with Patient A?
A: Yes.

Q: Did -- did you see Patient A on a regular basis?
A: Yes.

Q: And what did you notice about her problems?
A: Well, initially when I saw her, I noted -- I think our initial visit, she did have some jaundice, okay. And for the first several weeks, she started feeling better because she had -- and I think it's in my notes that she had reduced her pain medication, but then she did have to increase it later on in her treatment.

But as she progressed and the fact that her jaundice continued and she started developing abdominal pressure and distension which we sent her to the gastroenterologist to evaluate her for any blockage. She -- she started going downhill.
Q: And was there -- was there a period of time when you and Dr. Buttar were concerned about her continuing treatment?
A: Yes. I think it was after she had seen Dr. Clements, the gastroenterologist. And as a matter of fact, Dr. Buttar and I spoke with her about it. And I think that's documented in the charts, Dr. Buttar's note on 8/14.
Q: Okay. That would be page C7?
A: Yes.
Q: And were you present --
A: C7A, yeah.
Q: Were you present for that meeting as well?
A: Yes, yes.
Q: And what was discussed, if you recall?
A: Well, the results of the consultation with Dr. Clements, that she was not improving and -- but the daughter said that her mother did not want to give up hope and wanted to continue.
Q: And what did you and Dr. Buttar do as a result of that request?
A: We needed to do a treatment plan.
Q: And then -- and this patient died a few days after that?
A: That was the 14th. I believe it was that following weekend.
Q: And did you continue to monitor her treatment?
A: Yes.
QAnd -- and continue -- and did Dr. Buttar continue monitor her treatment?

AYes.

QOkay. With regard to Patient B, that's Exhibit 13, and whose notes are they, the first page, the intake sheet for this patient?

AThey're my notes.

QAnd tell us what you recall about Patient B.

AWell, she came in and I thought she was with her husband, but it was her fiancee because I always document who is in with the visit when we see the patient -- when I see the patient. And she was coming to us I think from Rutherfordton, North Carolina, that area. And she had been treated -- yeah, she had surgery for ovarian cancer in August '02 and she was coming to be treated by us April of '04.

QAnd do you happen to know who referred her for treatment?

AHer family physician.

QAnd I believe we've discussed there was some -- some better results in her lab work. What did you notice about the patient as she -- as she started treatment?

AOkay. She was a slightly quiet lady. When you talked with her and went over the plan as far as what she should do,
as far as there's something -- some procedures we would
like for them to do like the castor oil liver packs, they
help detoxify the liver and -- and when I would see her
I would always go over what we had recommended, to ask
her of her compliance if she was doing that and she did
not do that.
Also, based upon one lab test, the comprehensive diagnostic
stool analysis would show she had -- (inaudible) -- and
it was recommended the sensitivity of the bacteria for
her to be treated with Cipro. And I had seen her and then
the following office visit, I asked her if she was on it
and she said she wasn't, she had not filled the
prescription, but it is documented that that -- one of
our staff was in the room with me that I had given her
the prescription. So she was there, but she didn't always
follow through with what we asked her to do. She was
non-compliant.
QAnd did you discuss that -- that problem with Dr. Buttar?
AYes.
QAnd what was the -- was there a period of time when you all
tried to work with her on the compliance?
AYes.
QOkay.
At each visit I would always go over everything that we recommended and stressed the importance of everything.

Q: Did there come a point when you and Dr. Buttar determined that a change in plan needed to be made with regard to this patient?

A: Yes, it was. Yes.

Q: And what was that change?

A: That she was discharged from the practice for noncompliance.

Q: And when -- when that happened, did you document it in a note?

A: I didn't document it in a note. I documented it on the last visit or it really wasn't a visit, this was the day that she was discharged. I think that's -- that's the last note, it's C8.

Q: C8?

A: Uh-huh (yes).

Q: Okay. And that note is on what date?

A: That note is on -- I don't think I see a date on this, on my copy.

Q: It may have been taken off when the -- when the thing was redacted, I'm not sure.

A: Yes, because here is the last -- second to the last paragraph of my note, date of the option to see this physician at Lake Norman Regional Medical Center or go back to her family
physician by Dr. Theresa Romzick. And she -- I had her --
I wrote down her office number and she said she wanted
to go back to her family physician.
And I called Dr. Romzick and discussed the patient with
her and she was to see the doctor as soon as she could
get to that office and I sent her latest blood work with
her.

QAnd did -- did you continue to follow the patient until she
as back under the care of Dr. Romzick?
AWell -- well, she was to see the physician that day.
QOkay. Oh, so that was the day --
ARight, right. Uh-huh (yes). My note says, patient to see
physician as soon as we could get to the -- as she could
get to the office, so that was that day, but this was in
the morning, so she was going directly there.
QAll right. Now, with regard to -- now, on Patient C, that's
Exhibit 18. Whose notes are in the -- on the intake for
this patient?
ADr. Buttar's.
QAnd were you involved with this patient's care?
AYes, uh-huh (yes).
QAnd what do you recall about this patient?
AI thought he was a young man. I don't -- yeah, I see he was
a young man, 43 years old. He had a strong will to live
and he was always very compliant. And I do not recall
ever seeing anyone come with him to any of his office
visits.

QTo your knowledge, did he leave the practice on good terms?
AYes.

QNow, with regard to Patient D, that's the non-cancer patient
and I believe her office notes are at Exhibit 23.
AOkay.

QDid anyone besides you see this patient on -- as a prescriber
of treatment?
ANO.

QAnd what did this patient come to the office with?
AWell, she came here for the -- came to our office for evaluation
of heavy metal toxicity.

QAnd was that something that she reported to you in the first
visit?
AYes.

QDid it appear she had had lab work done elsewhere?
A previous challenge, is what we call that.

QOkay. But she came to be evaluated for heavy metal toxicity?
ASHe -- she came to be evaluated for heavy metal toxicity and
she had also had a history of constipation.
QOkay. Now, did you ever diagnose this patient with heavy metal constipation?

ANo, there is no such thing.

QAnd did you order a urine metal test that -- or I guess we've been calling it a challenge test.

AYes.

QAnd is that -- are those notes in -- or is that lab work in Exhibit 24?

AYeah. That was only ordered after she had had the physical and had her lab work, EKG and bone mass density because we don't order this until they've had their physical done.

QOkay. And then at the time -- once the results came back from the challenge test, what was determined as far as her heavy metal levels?

AWell, if you look at Exhibit 24 and you look at the test results, her levels of lead were 12 micrograms per gram of kilo -- of creatinine and her mercury was 5.4. And the reference range for lead is 5 and for mercury it's 4. Nickel was 14, the reference range is 12. And the reference range for tin is 10 and it was 9.8. She did have heavy metal toxicity.

QAnd based on those labs did you initiate some treatment for the --
AYes.

Q And what treatment did you initiate?

A To alternate IVs of EDTA specifically for lead and cadmium
and DMPS for mercury and the other metals.

Q And to your knowledge, was this a compliant patient?

A She was compliant up to -- well, I saw her one additional time
and let me get to that note.

Q The private sets would be in 23.

A Okay. I saw her initially 12/6 and then I saw her for a
follow-up visit and at that visit is when we go over some
of the tests like diagnostic and the previous challenge
and she had had three IV treatments and at that point she
had been compliant.

Q And then at some point was this patient discharged from the
practice?

A Yes, she was.

Q And what was the reason that this patient was discharged from
the practice?

A Well, if you look at the progress notes, I saw her on January
the 17th of '06 and then a month later she called telling
us she was having problems and then further on the note
she was upset because she had not seen Dr. Buttar.

And that was the first time I had any knowledge of it because
when we saw -- when I saw her on the 17th of January, her
subjective reports to me was that she had noticed she had
more energy and had less constipation, had been taking
her supplements as prescribed, had lost two pounds and
that was one of her goals, she wanted to lose weight.
And the only thing she had not done is started our GI liver
detox program that we had recommended.

Q Look if you would at Exhibit 25.
A Okay.
Q Is this -- and I'll represent to you that this is a letter
   written by Tasha Claridge to --
A Yes.
Q What is your memory about why Patient D left the practice?
A Well, later on I was told that she had tried to use -- she
   used a credit card to pay the payment and then tried to
   take the credit card back and that whole issue. I don't
   really get involved in that, so I don't keep up with those
details.
Q But you were aware that she was --
A I was aware, yes.
Q -- she was discharged from the practice for -- for non-payment
   or for reversing the credit card charge?
A Yes.
Q: Just tell the Board briefly in your own words what your observation is in general of the practice of Dr. Buttar in how he treats patients, how he interacts with patients.

A: I have worked with a lot of physicians over my span as a nurse and as a nurse practitioner. Dr. Buttar is very conscientious. He spends time with a patient. He has a tremendous gift. He's an intelligent man. He is an excellent teacher. His lectures are very good and his true gift is seeing patients.

And he has a sense or an ability to look at the physiology of a patient -- not of a patient, but of a body and that's how our approach is to treating patients.

When I started working with him, I worked with him for about a month because, you know, when you develop a collaborative relationship with a physician, part of it is to see if the physician wants to work with you, but part of it as a nurse practitioner is to see if you want to work with that physician as well.

And I have a step-grandson who had been diagnosed with autism and I had never seen any treatment for heavy metal toxicity in children with autism. As a result of that, I had my step-grandson come and be treated by Dr. Buttar.
Anyone who has ever gone through that or have any relatives that have had to deal with a child that is not what you thought that child was going to be or have developmental delays particularly after when that child did not have any up to a certain point of time, that's very traumatic for everyone.

And you have to have a lot of trust in an individual to look at treating a child from a non-traditional way when other people have said they might be mentally retarded or they have some severe developmental delays.

We treated my grandson, he has made a lot of progress. He also has treated my daughter just from a preventative perspective and has treated my mother. And as a result, my daughter had her first child and he's three months old today and he has not had any vaccines and he is starting his life being as clean as you possibly can be and not having anything to help compromise his immune system.

MS. GODFREY: That's all.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON:

Q Thank you for coming, Ms. Garcia. Do you have your CV in front of you?

AYes.

Q And isn't it true that you have no formal training in oncology
as a nurse practitioner?

A In what regard do you call formal training?

Q You're not an oncologist nurse practitioner?

DR. WALKER: Microphone please.

MR. JIMISON: Oh, I'm sorry.

Q You're not an oncologist nurse practitioner, are you?

A No. But I worked as an oncology nurse practitioner and I have
training in oncology. I've never taken the certification
as an oncology nurse practitioner.

Q And under the rules of the Medical Board and the Nursing Board,
a nurse practitioner can only practice within her
certification?

A Yes.

Q And your certification is as an adult nurse practitioner,
correct?

A Yes.

Q And there's actually a thing called a pediatric nurse
practitioner, is there not?

A Yes.

Q And you're not certified as a pediatric nurse practitioner,
are you?

A No, I'm not a pediatric nurse practitioner?

Q And during the two days you have been here, you heard the mother
of Patient D testify?

AYes.

QAnd that patient's mother basically consulted with you over the telephone, correct?

AYes.

QAbout her child that had autism?

AYes.

QAnd you sent her materials, transdermal chelation agents and -- and self-testing kit to her initially, correct, your office?

AYes, our office did, yes.

QOkay. At no time did your office ever personally see that child, correct?

AYes, we did.

QPrior to sending those materials?

ANo.

QOkay. At some point, she came down later, like four months later, correct?

AYes.

QSo it would be fair to say that the materials were sent to her to start the treatment of chelation therapy and the self-testing prior to your office personally seeing the child?
A: Yes, but we take an intake form on any child that we -- any
phone consult that we do.

Q: Well, under your view, it's good medical practice to begin
treating a child for severe autism without first seeing
the child?

A: We did the intake form. The parents fill out a detailed history
on the intake form.

Q: So it is good medical practice to do that?

A: We're not treating the child for autism, we're not treating
autism, we're treating the heavy metal toxicology --
toxicity. There happens to be a protocol for children.

Q: And with metal toxicity, it's okay to begin treatment of the
child for metal toxicity without seeing the child first?

A: We always like to see the child, but because of the distance,
we did not.

Q: You could have just refused, could you not, to sent them
materials until you saw the child?

A: Well, at that time, there's been such a backlog for patients
being seen that we did agree to do some phone consults.

Q: Okay. And sort of instruct the mother on how she could
self-treat her child?

A: Well, there are detailed instructions that are given.

Q: When Patient A -- when Patient A first met -- came in the office,
she didn't see Dr. Buttar, correct?

APatient A?

QPatient A.

AI saw her initially.

QBut Dr. Buttar was not there, correct?

AA lot of times Dr. Buttar comes in when I'm seeing a patient and he's seeing another patient. We did discuss the plan.

I did go over the plan with Dr. Buttar.

QAnd if you could turn to -- in the big notebook.

AOkay.

QIt's the Medical Board's big notebook, I believe.

AThis -- this --

QYes.

AOkay.

QTab 4 and page 95.

MS. GODFREY: That's not the Medical Board notebook.

MR. JIMISON: I'm sorry.

MS. GODFREY: I think it's not that notebook.

WITNESS: This one?

MR. JIMISON: No, that's not it.

MS. GODFREY: It's right there behind her.

MR. JIMISON: Oh, it's like on the chair.

MS. GODFREY: Here, I have it.
WITNESS: Okay.

MR. JIMISON: There you go.

Q(By Mr. Jimison) On page 95, that's -- is that the initial visit?

AIs there a section or just by pages?

QTab 4 in that. Tab 4 and then you can see the page numbering at the bottom.

AAnd what page did you say?

Q95. And if we can flip over to 96. Okay. This is your note, correct?

AYes, it is.

QOkay. And that last line, you actually note that the husband is this person and the daughter is this person?

AYes, uh-huh (yes).

QOkay. And -- and --

AOh, yeah, the last line I wrote their names, so when I communicate with them I can call them by name.

QAnd you did a impression, that's kind of a quarter of the way up and your impression is metastatic cervical cancer, correct?

AYes. And that's metastasized.

QAnd there's a metastasized to liver and heart.

AUh-huh (yes).
Q: Assessment and plan, patient to let us know if wants to follow with -- is that cancer plan?

A: Yes.

Q: So you had a conversation with Patient A and her family?

A: Yes, I did.

Q: And what did you say in that conversation with her?

A: Well, they came to us looking for treatment to help her mother, okay.

Q: With her cancer?

A: But that was her underlying issue was cancer, yes. And I explained to her what we do as far as cleaning up her immune system and her body to help make break the cancer itself.

Q: So you didn't tell them you treat cancer, you just told them you treated the immune system?

A: Yes, that's our approach, yes. To detoxify the body and to build up the -- enhance the immune system.

Q: And -- and your note says, patient to let us know, wants to follow -- and this is your handwriting, correct?

A: Yes, it is.

Q: -- with cancer plan?

A: Patient to let us know if wants to proceed with cancer plans, correct.

Q: It doesn't say immune building plan, does it?
ANo, it doesn't.

QIt doesn't say heavy metal detoxification plan, does it?

AWell, that's part of it.

QIt says cancer plan.

AYes, it is written there.

MR. JIMISON: Thank you, ma'am.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. GODFREY:

QJust a little follow-up. Ms. Garcia, with regard to Patient D that Mr. Jimison asked you about, was any -- were any medications sent to Patient D's parents prior to doing labs or getting labs?

AOn any patient we don't -- I'm sorry, we don't treat any patient prior to doing elementary lab work, standard lab which will be other tests. We don't do anything until we -- because our rule in our office is to do no harm.

QSo when --

AAnd how can you treat someone if you don't do anything, do any preliminary testing and we can see where the body's problems are.

QAnd so -- I know you don't have the record in front of you, but to your recollection and to your way of practicing, were -- were labs done to determine what types of problems or manifests for Patient D?
AWell, the labs were done primarily to look and see what the child's kidney function is because she did not -- we would not start anything without knowing the kidney function, that's very important. Also to look at liver function studies and also to look at iron levels.

Q And once those are determined the -- the treatment is sent to the parents, correct?

AYes.

Q And what kind of treatment is it? What -- what's -- how is it administered?

ATransdermally. Transdermally is you put it on the skin and rub it in.

Q And that's the only type of treatment that this patient was administered prior to coming to North Carolina?

A Also recommended some minerals and vitamins and some --

(inaudible).

Q And then was -- when the patient -- when the appointment was made for her to come North Carolina to review all those things, did you -- did you have further lab work done?

AYes. The lab work and other tests is done on a regular basis.

Q And when patients come from out-of-state, is there an effort made to try to -- to try to schedule with Dr. Buttar?

A If they want to see Dr. Buttar, they do. And if they don't,
they see me and I try to bring Dr. Buttar in the room.
He always tries to come in to see the patient.

MS. GODFREY: That's all I have.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Do you -- did you want to recross, Mr. Jimison?

MR. JIMISON: No, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Are there any Board questions?

Go ahead.

**EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:**

DR. McCULLOCH: Thanks for being here, Ms. Garcia.

WITNESS: You're welcome.

DR. McCULLOCH: I'm going to ask you perhaps a few questions that are difficult to answer. I don't think you're a bad person, they're just difficult questions and they may not be that hard. With respect to this transdermal --

WITNESS: COPS.

DR. McCULLOCH: -- are you aware of the efficacy of this treatment?

WITNESS: Yeah.

DR. McCULLOCH: It works?

WITNESS: It works.

DR. McCULLOCH: Studies?
WITNESS: I'm not aware of studies, but I see the result we see in patients.

DR. McCULLOCH: Now, did you send that treatment along with the test kit?

WITNESS: That's sent from our office.

DR. McCULLOCH: At the same time?

WITNESS: No.

DR. McCULLOCH: No?

WITNESS: No, it's not -- that's not sent until after the tests are done and we look at the tests and everything is okay. That's never sent out until we -- we know kidney function, iron levels, that sort of thing.

DR. McCULLOCH: Okay.

WITNESS: Never.

DR. McCULLOCH: But this patient was sent the treatment without having been seen by anybody in your office; is that correct?

WITNESS: Yes.

DR. McCULLOCH: I recall -- I'm going to ask you this because you may know, somebody -- I think it might have been done a videotape, I think it was a videotaped deposition -- something about someone being instructed on how to give a vaccination to someone at home. Have
you ever done that?

WITNESS: No.

DR. McCULLOCH: I didn't make that up.

MR. KNOX: I'm not sure.

WITNESS: I don't give vaccinations. I wouldn't instruct on that.

DR. McCULLOCH: I need some chelation.

MR. KNOX: You'll have to talk to the doctor afterward.

DR. McCULLOCH: All right. Now --

WITNESS: But there are things we have to do beforehand.

DR. McCULLOCH: Okay. What percentage of patients that come for treatment receive chelation therapy, roughly?

WITNESS: I big portion of them.

DR. McCULLOCH: A 100 percent?

WITNESS: 98 maybe, but a big portion of our patients.

DR. McCULLOCH: So every patient that comes to you -- through your door has heavy metal toxicity?

WITNESS: They're evaluated for that.

DR. McCULLOCH: Every patient is treated for it, so everyone must have it?

WITNESS: Well, I can't recall -- no, I have seen --

DR. McCULLOCH: Virtually everybody?

WITNESS: A lot of people do, yes.
DR. McCULLOCH: Have you been treated?
WITNESS: Yes, I have.

DR. McCULLOCH: I figured so. Does that seem unusual to you that 100 percent of the patients that come through your door would have a particular condition?

WITNESS: Well, when we look at what we are doing in our environment. What are we doing with toxic waste? What are we doing with pollutants? Where is that going? It goes in our water supply, it goes in foods we eat and what do we do, we ingest that.

DR. McCULLOCH: So it does not seem unusual?

WITNESS: It doesn't. It would have seemed unusual to me six years ago, but not today. I mean, my daughter is 35 years old, we tested her. She had some not severe, but she's young, so she did that from a preventive perspective. I have high levels of lead. I made a joke out it after I got a speeding ticket, so they said you had a lead foot. I said, well, I guess I do. That's just a joke, but, yes.

I mean, if you think about it and what we've done in our environment, what do we do in our environment to make sure we detoxified it or to take care of ourselves? What do we do with processed foods?
DR. McCULLOCH: That's all I have.

DR. WALKER: Ms. Garcia?

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: Let me follow-up on one point that Dr. McCulloch raised.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: Do you know what the medical practice laws are in Michigan?

WITNESS: No. I was a nurse practitioner and lived in Michigan at one time.

DR. WALKER: Would you consider prescribing transdermal chelation therapy a form of medical practice?

WITNESS: Yes, it could be. I've don't -- I haven't thought about it.

DR. WALKER: Did -- did it occur to you that perhaps it would be wise to check the regulations in the state of Michigan before you started practicing medicine across state lines in a state that -- are you currently licensed in Michigan?

WITNESS: No, I'm not, sir.

DR. WALKER: Did that thought of -- is that -- is that a consideration when you all were taking telephone consults?
WITNESS: It hasn't been.

DR. WALKER: Let me go over a few points of the medical records of the patients that you have helped take care of.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: And I echo Dr. McCulloch's remarks, I don't mean to be argumentative, I'm just trying to sort of establish what's in the record versus what you said. And correct me if I misstate what you have said.

WITNESS: Yes, sir.

DR. WALKER: At one point you said that before your patients receive any treatment they have a history and physical and laboratories; is that correct?

WITNESS: And an office visit for adults, yes sir.

DR. WALKER: Well, and when you said that I was intrigued because when I read the notes on Patient A, Patient A came in, according to your notes, on July 20th and you went through the history and you had your discussions and then you started the patients on multiple supplements or substances. There was no physical exam done on that day according your note.

WITNESS: Well, we start -- we give them the supplements, but they don't start them until after they've collected
the comprehensive diagnostic stool analysis and we do the
physical on them.

DR. WALKER: Okay. Your second note was 7/24/06 and the
top of the note was, here for physical slash BMD slash
EKG, feels fine, okay.
And then when I read your note, you report on the effects
of the supplements, you report labs, but there's no
physical exam, though.

WITNESS: May I leaf through here?

DR. WALKER: Sure. You can look in --

WITNESS: At which book? I mean, I have --

DR. WALKER: -- in your -- Dr. Buttar's book, it's on --

WITNESS: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: I don't think you'll find it in our book.
You have to select --

DR. WALKER: Well, actually is this your book?

MS. GODFREY: Yes.

DR. WALKER: It's under Tab 9.

MS. GODFREY: Right, but the physical exam, I don't think
is under Tab 9. I'm glad to hand that --

DR. WALKER: Well, are you stating that some of the
physical exams were included and some are not?

MS. GODFREY: Well, I put the progress notes and I think
the physical exam is in a different section.

DR. WALKER: Well, in reviewing the records, there were -- there was one occasion of a physical exam by Dr. Buttar on your form and was very thorough. And then there were notes in your progress notes of physical exams later on, so I was --

WITNESS: His visits --

DR. WALKER: Pardon me?

WITNESS: With all his visits --

DR. WALKER: Correct, right.

WITNESS: -- the exam, not as extensive because we did an exam.

DR. WALKER: Right. So I guess is -- is what counsel is saying is that y'all gave us incomplete records there.

MS. GODFREY: No. What I'm saying is that I -- that Mr. Jimison gave you a complete set of the records. I was trying to not duplicate what he was doing. And indeed in the records and this is D5A there is a physical exam of this patient.

The problem and I apologize to the Board, Mr. Jimison and I, we coordinated ahead of time, but we did not. Of course, he didn't ask me about his exhibits and I didn't ask him about mine.
But in the -- in the complete record there is -- and I can't find it, I can't locate it for you in Mr. Jimison's, but I can show you a complete record that at B5A in our records, there is a physical exam on 7/24/06 of this patient.

DR. WALKER: Okay. So in other words, it wasn't real clear from what I reviewed.

MS. GODFREY: And I apologize for that, Dr. Walker. That -- that is definitely my fault.

MR. JIMISON: If you look to Tab 4 in the Medical Board's, the complete record I believe is page 92.

MS. GODFREY: Is it page 92?

DR. WALKER: You're exactly right and I apologize for bringing up an issue which was apparently not the case because of the record review I did.

WITNESS: That's okay. I knew there was a physical note, so just locating it.

DR. WALKER: Well, I have no other questions.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I need -- and thank you, by the way, for being here, Ms. Garcia.

You said something and I just didn't hear all of it. You said that and it had to do with Patient B and you said the stool showed something and you gave them Cipro.
WITNESS:  Dysbiotic flora.

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  Can you tell me what dysbiotic flora is?

WITNESS:  Dysbiotic is -- well, we explain it to patients that it's bad bacteria. It's bacteria that is not good bacteria that can create problems in the gut.

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  Can I see that lab test?

WITNESS:  Sure.

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  Because -- go ahead.

WITNESS:  And we've got tests that also gives you a sensitivity of what the bacteria is sensitive to and Cipro was for that -- one of those.

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  Yeah, I would just like to see that --

WITNESS:  Sure.

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  -- because generally even with, you know, with many infectious diarrheas, you don't even want to treat them with antibiotics, they're self limited. The more antibiotics you give, the more you're giving the antibiotics that --

WITNESS:  And at the same time we give them good antibiotics as well.

PRESIDENT RHYNE:  -- clear the good bacteria out of your gut.
WITNESS: Well, that's one reason sometimes they have dysbiotic flora is they don't have enough good bacteria --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right.

WITNESS: -- so we treat that as well. Let me find that.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And -- and then the antibiotics tend to make it worse and that is why --

WITNESS: This is B, Patient B we're talking about?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. You had testified of Patient B.

WITNESS: Yes, it's B.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Now, actually, I was looking in your book, I wasn't looking in the Medical Board book, so it may be --

WITNESS: Is this our -- this is --

MR. JIMISON: Yeah.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'll tell you what, Dr. Walker will look for it while I go ahead.

MR. JIMISON: I guess it's a little confusing.

WITNESS: It's F1 in the resource I'm looking at.

MR. JIMISON: That's your notebook --

WITNESS: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: Right. It's a non-redacted, but she can --

MR. JIMISON: But just to clarify this entire issue, what was decided was the Medical Board book for Patients A
through D to be the medical records. Those are in the big thick book.

DR. McCULLOCH: So we have those?

MR. JIMISON: Yeah. And they're actually in alphabetical order unfortunately and not correlated, so Patient -- which one are you looking for?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: It's Patient B.

MR. JIMISON: Patient B would be Tab 3.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Tab 3, okay.

DR. McCULLOCH: I'll look, too.

MS. GODFREY: And the lab work which is in --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Oh, is that D, Patient --

MS. GODFREY: Patient --

MR. KNOX: D was four.

MR. JIMISON: Yeah, they're in alphabetical order.

MR. KNOX: Patient B was two.

MR. JIMISON: By -- by their last name, they're in alphabetical order, so E is five.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I see something that shows parasites.

WITNESS: It looks like this. Can you see that?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And what is it -- oh, it says started parasite protocol. What is parasite protocol?

WITNESS: As reference to this or are you asking me another
question?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. On one of the other things it said started parasite protocol and what is your parasite protocol?

WITNESS: All right. It is a number of things to treat parasites. I can't tell it to you by memory. We use in -- don't use it on a regular basis, we have a treatment protocol for that.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Even though this lab test for parasites, there's no parasites seen?

WITNESS: Well, that's based on the basis that there are parasites within cancerous tumors, within tumors and there is a Ph.D. --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, wait, whoa, whoa, whoa. Where did you get that from?

WITNESS: There is -- I can't recall the Ph.D.'s name. I would have to ask Dr. Buttar to comment on that, if that's okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. So -- so in other words, you're using Cipro to treat bacteria in the stool --

WITNESS: The dysbiotic flora, the Cipro, yeah.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right. You would expect that's a normal finding of bacteria in the stool. Everybody's stool has
WITNESS: Well, yeah, but this is three plus. The imbalance is for commensurable bacteria. The beneficial flora is of course the good bacteria and you want that to be higher. You see she has no bifidobacteria.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right, but she has four plus E. coli and three plus bifidocater.

WITNESS: Yeah, and that's good.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah.

WITNESS: And then if you look the last page under sensitivities, bacteria susceptibilities.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right. I see that, but as you know there again it's generally not recommended that you give antibiotics, all you do is deplete the good bacteria out of the stool. Okay.

Let me go on and ask you just two other questions --

WITNESS: Certainly.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- and I'll be finished. What thing struck me -- has struck me today and that it seems like every patient -- this goes along with what they said, every patient we have got the challenge test has too much lead and too much mercury.

Isn't it a little strange to you that almost 100 percent
of patient -- the same patients have the same things to
show up in their labs.
WITNESS: They don't have the same levels and they are
elevated levels.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. Does it make you think that
that's what you get if you did that test that everybody
will have those elevated levels?
WITNESS: No. It's a specialized test --
PRESIDENT RHYNE: It doesn't strike you as a little strange
that a 100 percent of the patients have the same results?
WITNESS: No.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. And let me just go on then.
Throughout the day also you have said that some people
have gotten vaccines and that vaccines are helpful and
they stimulate the immune system. And in the e-mails --
I think we've heard that and certainly in this e-mail in
your book, Patient B is saying he had two vaccines last
weekend, one with salmonella and strep -- and strep
bacteria.
MR. KNOX: That's an e-mail that he sent from Mexico where
he was being treated back from this clinic where he was
just telling what was happening to him in Mexico.
MS. GODFREY: Because that wasn't -- that wasn't --
MR. KNOX: I maybe didn't make it clear.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No, but Dr. Buttar had testified that he sent him down and he was glad he went to Mexico, that he had agreed with that treatment and had sent him down there.

MR. KNOX: I'm certainly not going to argue with you about what the evidence was, that he felt he had stress and he recommended to go to Mexico because he thought -- he goes to Mexico and one of the treatment they got, he e-mails one of the -- Nina back and tells her how he's doing and in that it says vaccines, but I don't think Dr. Buttar would prescribe that.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Then -- then it's my misunderstanding. I understood Dr. Buttar to say he had actually agreed with the therapies down in Mexico and, in fact, had done some of the same therapies.

DR. BUTTAR: Do you want me to answer that?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: No, that's -- that's -- that's okay.

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Well, let's look again since they're talking about vaccines and you're saying something else about vaccines.

MR. KNOX: Okay.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: I'll withdraw that question. I don't have anything else. Thank you.

RE CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. JIMISON: 

Q I do have a question just based on -- I do believe from your direct testimony, Ms. Garcia, that a child had not gotten his vaccines, your step-grandson?

A My -- my grandson.

Q Do you advise children about getting -- or parents of children not getting vaccines?

A We made that decision for my grandson.

Q I mean, on other patients.

A That's a -- that is a personal decision.

MR. JIMISON: Okay.

FURTHER EXAMINATION BY THE PANEL MEMBERS:

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I have one other question. Have you read the North Carolina Medical Board's policy?

WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

WITNESS: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JIMISON: At this -- do you want to add anything else.

MS. GODFREY: Yes. As long as we're sure on the record that we have all the exhibits in that we listed, I think
we did -- I think we clarified that already and I think
we said that there were some --

MR. JIMISON: I think we've said that Number 3 and 50 was
tendered, but not admitted.

MS. GODFREY: Right. And of the ones on our list, Exhibit
30 and 51 through 54 were not tendered.

MR. JIMISON: Those are just deposition transcripts.

MS. GODFREY: Those are deposition transcripts that were
of witnesses that testified.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Are we ready for closing
arguments? Is there any -- any other --

MR. JIMISON: We're ready, however, we have one rebuttal
witness --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Oh, okay.

MR. JIMISON: -- and Mr. Mansfield we'll be calling.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Proceed.

MR. MANSFIELD: Thank you, Madame President. In
rebuttal, we would call Dr. Buttar back to the witness
stand, please.

MR. KNOX: Well, I don't want to be a technician, but the
truth of the matter is, if you have another lawyer examine
and then they go bring in another one who needs to be
examiner now is just absolutely contrary to procedure.
MR. JIMISON: He's on the Medical Board staff in the legal department. I don't think there are two lawyers.

MR. KNOX: Well, sure.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, actually I was just glancing through the rule, Mr. Knox mentioned that to me in the hall. I was glancing through the rule and it says that in cross-examining a witness for instance when Mr. Jimison was cross-examining Dr. Buttar earlier we could not take turns. It wouldn't be fair for Marcus to go until he got tired and let me take a look at Dr. Buttar, that's what the rule is about.

Dr. Buttar was testifying as -- as a direct testimony witness for his case called by Mr. Knox at that time and we are now calling him as a rebuttal witness and we're not going to take turns questioning.

I have about ten minutes worth of questions, I think at the outside, and I don't believe it's contrary to the rules.

MS. GODFREY: Well, and I will state as far as that goes as a rebuttal witness, the -- the testimony needs to be limited to matters that were brought up in our case, not -- not new matters. I believe that is the rule.

MR. MANSFIELD: Correct. Madame President, I intend to ask him only about previous testimony in his case.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Proceed. You've already been sworn in, Dr. Buttar --

DR. BUTTAR: Yes, ma'am.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- so you can have a seat.

DR. BUTTAR: Thank you, ma'am.

WHEREUPON,

    RASHID ALI BUTTAR, D.O.,

    having been previously sworn,

    was examined and testified

    as follows:

REBUTTAL EXAMINATION BY MR. MANSFIELD:

QDr. Buttar.

AYes, sir.

    MR. KNOX: The rules keep changing and I mean -- I'm --

QDr. Buttar, you testified previously today that you were involved in the passage of House Bill 886 at the North Carolina General Assembly, correct?

AYes, sir, I was.

QAnd that was in the year of 2003, correct?

AThat's correct.

QAnd I believe you testified earlier today that you testified
to the House Committee on Health; is that right?

AI don't remember saying which committee. I testified I wouldn't even know which committee it was. I was just -- wound up and pointed in the right direction.

QDo you remember whether it was in April of 2003 that you gave the testimony that you recall giving?

AI recall that the day was the same day that my past -- I served with the 101st Air Assault Division was moving into Iraq and I remember it was that day. I don't remember what that day was, but I believe that would be around the right time at some time in April.

QThank you. And did you work with any legislators with regard to House Bill 886?

A Did I work with any legislators?

QWell, did you ever have a conversation with any legislator in the General Assembly about House Bill 886?

A Oh, I spoke with quite a number of them.

QDid you -- other than testifying in a front of a group within a committee setting, did you ever have any other conversations with legislators?

A I don't remember meeting any legislators one on one.

QIf -- if I asked you whether you had ever met with Representative Thomas Wright in particular, would you remember him?
AThe name is --

MS. GODFREY: Well, objection.

MR. KNOX: Objection.

A-- not familiar to me, I have no --

MS. GODFREY: I mean, and -- and what's this got to do
with what he testified to on -- in his -- in his original
testimony?

MR. MANSFIELD: Madam President, he testified about
participating in the process and I just have a few
preliminary questions about what he did in the process
and then I'll get to the point.

MR. KNOX: How can that be relevant to what's going on
it with this today.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: He's the one that brought it up that
he testified.

MR. MANSFIELD: He brought it up.

MR. KNOX: I understand, but then you wouldn't let us show
that there was retribution as a result of it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I beg your pardon.

MR. MANSFIELD: Well, I don't have any questions -- well,
I'm not -- my questions are limited to his testimony about
his participation and his personal knowledge of what
happened with the legislature.
PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead and proceed. He's the one that brought it up when he testified.

Q(By Mr. Mansfield) Did you ever make any suggestions to anyone involved in the process of House Bill 886 regarding concepts or particular language that you -- you thought should be added to the Medical Practice Act?

MR. Mansfield, all I remember is that you and Mr. Henderson came in and slouched in a chair to show intimidation with 13 members of the Medical Board and the North Carolina Medical Society.

And you had no interest in talking to me after the public -- the -- the public hearing -- excuse me, the press conference and then immediately you all wanted to talk to me.

I was also essentially threatened by the North Carolina Medical Society attorney who told me that, why don't you be a smart boy and not testify because, one, you know you're not going to change the law; and, two, you know it's only going to make it difficult for you to practice medicine in the state of North Carolina.

I also know that two weeks after I testified I was given -- I was delivered a registered letter while I was talking to Mr. Henderson on the phone and that the --

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, I apologize for
interrupting the witness, but my question is whether he 
made any suggestions to anybody about the concepts or 
language that should be added to the Medical Practice Act.  
And this -- I apologize -- apologize that if this is by 
way of explanation of his suggestions or concepts --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Just answer his question.

AI don't -- you're asking me a question, ma'am -- he's asking 
me a question that I can only tell him what I remember.  
I remember having conversations with you sitting at a 
table with a number of other people.

QOkay.

AI remember that.

QThat's when you made suggestions to me about what ought to 
change in the Medical Practice Act?

AI remember you asking me that there were certain things that 
were being proposed that may not be fair because you gave 
me an example that if a doctor cuts off the wrong leg, 
it's not fair that he be -- he be allowed to practice for 
another six months without the ability of the Medical Board 
to intervene and I agreed with that and we changed that 
language. I remember that.

I cannot specifically remember what you just asked me 
because I don't remember that, but I do remember having
conversations with you one-on-one and among -- with a number of other members of the North Carolina Medical Society and the North Carolina Medical Board.

QOkay. Before you testified to the General Assembly about House Bill 886, did you read it?

AOf course, we read it. We came up with certain language -- and when I say we, I'm talking about the members of the North Carolina Integrative Medical Society as well as our lobbyists and there were certain changes that were -- that were proposed and that were made and it went back and forth and it's like a Mexican bizarre with people negotiating, but that's --

QOkay. Thank -- thank you, that's precisely.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, I'd like to ask the Court Reporter to mark a document as the next numbered exhibit for the Board.

MR. JIMISON: 26.

MR. MANSFIELD: Exhibit 26. Would you --

MS. GODFREY: Can we see a copy of what you're marking, please?

MR. MANSFIELD: Yes.

MR. KNOX: May we just have a chance to look at it?

MR. MANSFIELD: Sure, absolutely.
MR. JIMISON: You can keep that one, Dr. Buttar, and I'll hand it up to the Board Members.

MR. KNOX: Which section are you talking about?

MR. MANSFIELD: Have you had a chance to take a look, Mr. Knox and Ms. Godfrey?

MR. KNOX: Well, can you tell me which section? It's a pretty broad five-page document to review in 30 seconds.

Q Dr. Buttar --

MS. GODFREY: Excuse me, do you have the section that you want us to review?

MR. MANSFIELD: I have some questions for the witness actually, Madame President, if I might be permitted to --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Proceed.

MR. MANSFIELD: -- whenever you're ready.

MR. KNOX: Again, we're going to object to the record to the relevance of this to about three cases.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead.

Q (By Mr. Mansfield) Dr. Buttar, can you identify the document that's been marked and it's marked as Exhibit 26. Can you look at the first page of that and tell me what that is?

AI can only read to you what it says. I don't recognize it, I don't remember ever seeing anything like this, but it
says General Assembly of North Carolina, Session 20 --
2003 House Draft, 70244, which was not the bill that we
proposed.

Q Do you see a short title for this bill?
A I do not. Where would that be?

Q Did you testify previously today that you participated in the
passage of a bill called Due Process for Physicians?
A Yes.

Q And do you see that phrase on the first page of this document?
A I don't. Where would I -- oh, I see a short title, yes, I'm
      sorry, yes.

Q Thank you. And -- and just to get back to where we were a
      minute ago, I asked you already whether you read this before
      you testified at the General Assembly and you said, yes, correct?
A I don't remember reading anything like this. We had a specific
      component that we had. It was one paragraph that had been
      submitted and that had been changed, but I don't remember
      ever seeing this whole thing, no.

Q Okay. Well, then let me direct you to some particular language
      and ask you if you remember that language. It's on page
      3 of this document and you'll see that there are line
      numbers on this down the side.
A

Yes.

And at line 34 there's some underlying language and I would
ask you to read out loud that underlying language beginning
at line 34 down to -- to the end of the page, please.

A

From -- starting from line 34 you said?

Q

Yes, sir. The standards of --

Ms. Godfrey: Well --

Mr. Knox: Objection.

Ms. Godfrey: We're going to object to this. I mean, he
says he does not remember this particular document and
I think it's unfair to have him -- to cross-examine him
about it if he doesn't remember the document or remember --

Witness: I've never seen this document. I just remember
one paragraph. It's about integrative medicine.

Mr. Mansfield: Madame President, I'd like to direct him
to some language and ask him if that compares to the
paragraph that he was referring to.

President Rhyne: Proceed.

Q (By Mr. Mansfield) So it's for the purpose of some of your
attorneys and some of the Board Members, if you could read
that language and then -- but I can make my question two
parts. I'm asking you if this is the language that you
were talking about, the paragraph that you were interested
It's beginning at 34 you said?

Yes, sir. The standards of practice in any specialty, yeah.

Mine says: Such license may appear personally and through counsel, may cross-examine the witness.

What page are we on? A number of the page.

Page -- page 3, and by that I mean the numbered page 3.

Oh, the number of the page, I'm sorry.

I'm sorry. It's a two-sided copy.

Gotcha.

So the lower right-hand corner will say page 3 and at line 34 on the right-hand side there's some underlying language that begins with the standards of practice.

Right. The standards of practice in any specialty, including complimentary treatments, shall be defined by specialists in that field. Continue?

Please.

The Board shall not annul, suspend, revoke the license of or deny a license to a -- to a person -- to -- to any person, harass, or initiate an investigation solely because of that person's practice of a therapy that is experimental, nontraditional, or that departs from acceptable and prevailing medical practices unless, by a preponderance
of the evidence, the Board can establish that the treatment has a safety risk of harm to the patient greater than the prevailing treatment or that the treatment is generally not effective -- as effective in comparison to the effective rates of other prevailing treatments.

Q Dr. Buttar, is that language the same or similar to the paragraph you were referring to before?

A Yes, Mr. Mansfield, it is.

Q Okay. Thank you.

Let me also direct your attention to the preceding page, page 2. In the lower left-hand corner of page 2 at line 28, the underlying language and we can just give everybody a chance to read it. You can read it silently, if you like or you can read it out loud, and I would like to ask you again if this is some of the language in the paragraph that you were referring to that you wished to be added to the Medical Practice Act.

A If this is the language, it certainly wasn't adhered to in my case this time, was it?

Q Well, is that language similar to or the same as the paragraph you were referring to earlier?

A I actually don't remember this being part of it, but I think it's good it's in there.
QOkay. Then let me go back to your testimony to the General Assembly. Is it fair to say that when you testified you were testifying in support of the notions and the language you read on page 3 from line 34 and forward?

MR. KNOX: Object again to the relevance.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Madame President, it was Dr. Buttar and his counsel who repeatedly said that the -- his conduct is to be judged by the standard that's reflected in this language.

WITNESS: Mr. Mansfield, if I may --

MR. MANSFIELD: Sure.

WITNESS: -- it also --

MR. KNOX: Objection. I don't want you do that, I'm objecting for the record, just for the record.


AIt says that the power of the Board to subpoena is limited to persons with knowledge related to a matter before the Board and yet of these four cases brought against me, three of them were all hearsay and yet it's in the Board and yet it was complaints against me of people that lied and said that they were there when they had never even been there. Three people, so I'm -- I'm sorry.
QNo, I'm sorry. I was just going to make sure I understood
the language you're talking about. You're talking about
the page 2 again at line 28, correct?
AYes, sir.
QOkay. Those most recent comments you made about that language?
AYes, sir.
QThank you. And so when you -- my question before was when
you -- when Mr. Knox objected was when you testified for
the General Assembly, isn't it true that you testified
in support of the provisions on page 3 again at line 34?
AYes, sir, it is. It was for due process and I believe that
was part of the due process.
QCertainly. And after you testified to the General Assembly
about this language that you had seen then as previous --
we've previously referred to as the paragraph similar or
the same as this language, did you continue to follow the
progress of House Bill 886 through the summer?
MR. KNOX: Objection to relevance. And I know you can
go on, but I want to note this for the record, but go ahead.
AI think I mentioned, Mr. Mansfield, that the -- the internal
price freedom is constant vigilance and I believe we
dropped the ball on that one.
QWell, my question was, did you visit the General Assembly during
the summer?

That summer?

Yes, sir, 2003 after you testified about the bill.

AI -- I came to the Assembly twice, two days in a row both in April, both back to back and I never came to the Assembly again. I came on -- the day that I came was I think whatever date you said, that I had to come back the next day because I had -- I was supposedly invited, but they didn't hear me and then after my press conference one of the state representatives insisted that I be there and they adjourned at -- they stopped everything at 10:00 the following day and they heard my testimony, but I had never been -- I've never been back to the Legislature after that.

You testified previously that after you testified the bill passed the House.

Yes, sir.

And did you have any occasion to review the bill or language in the bill at any point in time after it passed the House? MR. KNOX: Objection, relevance.

AI am not certain that we did. Again, as I said, we were a little overwhelmed with the fact that we passed this bill so fast. We had a lobbyist that was looking at this. I know that it was changed when it went on and I think
the Senate voted on it sometime in December, but I was not there and I am not aware of what the wording was. I know the wording has changed since then, like last year or two years ago, but this original I'm not aware of what happened with that. I wasn't directly -- I'm the president of the society, but there were other doctors involved with it. There were lobbyists and other administrative people that were involved with it.

So the question you're asking, I'm sorry, but I don't -- I can't -- I can't give you an exact time because I don't remember.

QI'm sorry, just so I'm clear, are you saying that you never again read a version of the bill after you read whatever you read in preparation for your testimony?

AWe submitted language that we wanted and it was --

MS. GODFREY: Objection.

A-- there was something that you had -- you guys wanted us to consider, I think because you guys knew that we had the ear of the Legislature at that point.

I even had Dr. Kanof call me at home to make sure I got home that night which was very interesting. There was all of a sudden a lot of interest in my well-being and I appreciate that.
And I just remember that the language that we had originally submitted and that the rest of the group that we had discussed with had been negotiated down to a certain amount, but what -- what happened with it subsequent to that date, I cannot remember.

I do know it was changed. There were some words that were taken in and out. There were some other doctors that were looking at it closer than I was, doctors that are here in Raleigh that I'm not and that's all I can tell you. But I'm -- I did not come up again after April whatever it was.

QOkay.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, I'd like to ask the Court Reporter to mark another document as Exhibit 27. And, Marcus, I'm going to hand you two copies so Mr. Knox and Ms. Godfrey --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. Mr. Mansfield, do you have copies for us.

MR. MANSFIELD: And I have copies also for you, Madame President.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And you said this would be ten minutes.

MR. MANSFIELD: Oh, I'm sorry, this -- I'm really almost done.
Q(By Mr. Mansfield) I'll be very quick about this, Dr. Buttar.

You're -- you're now looking at what's been marked Exhibit Number 27 and I would ask you to take a moment to look at that and tell me whether you have read the contents of this document previously and I'm particularly interested in page -- what's numbered page 2, so the back side of the first piece of paper. Have you ever read this -- this document or the language in Section 2 or Section 4 on page 2?

MR. KNOX: Object to the relevance.

AThe 90-2.1 where integrative medicine is defined, I'm familiar with that, yes, sir. And what was the next section, I'm sorry?

QSection 4.

AI -- I think that sounds familiar, yes.

QOkay. Dr. Buttar, are you aware of whether the language -- I'm sorry, I'm jumping back and forth from the documents. I'm now going to ask you a question about Exhibit 26.

Are you --

AIs it the first one?

QYes, sir. Do you still have a copy of that?

AYes, sir, I do.

QAnd I'm going to direct your attention back to page 3 again
beginning at line 34. Are you aware of whether that language that I had you read out loud a little earlier and that you said was the same or similar to your paragraph, are you aware whether that language was removed from the bill prior to the time it was passed into law?

MR. KNOX: Objection.

MS. GODFREY: Objection. And he says he's not been to the Legislature since April.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, he doesn't have to go to the Legislature to be aware of whether the language was taken out. And he's testified as to continuing activities, monitoring -- he remained vigilant and if he -- if he's not aware, that's fine, I'm just asking.

AWe were not vigilant, that's what I said. That was our fault.

Could you -- I'm not quite sure what you're asking. Are you saying that line 34 on the first document on page 3 --

QYes.

A-- whether that's been taken out.

QThat language. My question was, that language that you supported in your testimony, are you aware of whether that language was removed from the bill such that by the time it passed into law as you described that that language
was no longer in the bill?

MR. KNOX: Objection.

AI was not aware that it had changed out significantly, but

obviously it has. I know -- as I said before when you

asked me, I knew that it had been changed.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, I would like to offer

into evidence Exhibits 26 and 27 and I don't have any more

questions for Dr. Buttar although there may be some

cross-examination.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Do you want to cross-examine?

MS. GODFREY: Well, we're going to object to these being

offered into evidence. I wasn't aware that we were going

to be -- I think this is what they call legislative history

and it's used by -- sometimes by courts to -- to look at

the law as it -- as it evolved, but I don't think it's
given a lot of weight because the law is what the final

law is.

And I don't think that what the House did and what the

Senate did and what language went in and out has a lot
to do with what we're about today.

And I -- and, again, I know of no relevance of this to

this proceeding that is under, as I understand it, the

law as it was finally enacted. Your Honor, I'm sorry,
Dr. Rhyne, it's getting late. But -- but again, I'm just not seeing any relevance to -- oh, to -- to what we're about today which is what happened in Patients A, B, C and D and whether or not if the Board should take any action against Dr. Buttar based on his treatment of those patients.

That's what we're here about today, not about what happened in the Legislature.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, if I may respond if Ms. Godfrey is through.

The standard for admission into evidence first -- first is that something must be relevant. It's -- this is relevant because I've asked Dr. Buttar about facts related to these documents and the questions I asked were based on his previous testimony in which he made statements including that he was involved in the process, that he testified to the Legislature, that he gave a press conference.

And he testified that to the effect of, and I'm not quoting, but to the effect of that the Medical Board was targeting him and other integrative physicians unfairly and that he was at the Legislature trying to change the Medical Practice Act in order to protect practitioners like himself
and including himself.

Also, in his -- his case, both in defending against our expert witness and in presenting their own expert witnesses, Dr. Buttar and his counsel repeatedly indicated that this Board must judge his conduct by the standard of an integrative medicine physician. And Dr. Buttar explains why that was so, because he went to the Legislature and worked to change the law.

So I've asked him questions about facts when I -- and I would modify my motion to say with regard to Exhibit 26, I would like to move into evidence the portion that -- that if you wish to exclude some part of this document, I would move into evidence the portions that Dr. Buttar just testified about with regard to the language that he recognizes that were changes that he himself sought and testified about to the Legislature.

And with that explanation, I would again ask that Exhibits 26 and 27 be admitted into evidence.

MR. KNOX: Again, we again object. Now, he said he's got a whole document and would like for you to decide which part you're going to accept in the last hour. They really have not introduced this until today at the closing. The exhibits should have been handed out earlier when we had
the conference when they were exchanged and it's not relevant to this case.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Can I have the attorneys approach please?

MR. KNOX: Yeah.

(BENCH CONFERENCE)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I think we need to -- we're going to take a ten minute break and we're going to start with closing arguments. In fact, do you want to make it five minutes, Mr. Knox?

MR. KNOX: Whatever you say, you're the -- you're the head doctor.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

(6:03 P.M. - 6:10 P.M. RECESS)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Mr. Knox or Ms. Godfrey, would you like to make a closing statement?

MS. GODFREY: I will.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Please proceed.

CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. GODFREY:

I want to tell you a couple of things I'm not going to talk about first of all. I'm not going to try to talk
to you about medical ethics. I -- I'm a lawyer, I have been trained as a lawyer. I'm not going to try to tell doctors how to interpret the medical ethics. I'm also not going to give a jury speech. You all aren't a jury. You're the findings of fact that have specialized training in this arena. And while I want to convey to you that Dr. Buttar's case is, I think, very plain here. I'm not going to strive to do anything like that because this is not the proper forum for that.

I do want to talk about this issue that Mr. Mansfield has brought before you and I brought before you about what is the standard of care because I think -- I think that's really what we're looking at here, whether or not Dr. Buttar violated the standard of care. And the question is, what is the standard of care?

There's a whole lot of law in that area in the medical malpractice field. And I will tell you having participated in some of those cases, that the standard of care is very specific in the law of North Carolina, in the case law of North Carolina. The standard of care is determined by a practitioners in the same or similar specialty.

And the reason for that in the medical malpractice arena
is because it would be grossly unfair to hold a general practitioner or family doctor with a doctor that practices with a broad range of patients and conditions to the same standards as a specialist. And that is what I argue to you the standard of care is in this case.

Now, I want to go back a little bit and talk about history.

Marcus -- Mr. Jimison handed up to you the George Guess case and that is the only case I know of that has come through to interpret anything about the Medical Practice Act.

For whatever reason, cases since then have not reached the appellate levels necessary to generate published opinions. They may have gone to a Superior Court judge, but Superior Court judge's opinions are not published and are not precedent. The only legal precedent in -- in this area is the George Guess case which ended up in the Supreme Court in the year 1990.

And Mr. Jimison has argued to you that this case is -- that it stands for the fact that there is only one standard of care by which we judge medical providers and it's the same standard of care no matter what kind of doctor you are.

The facts of the Guess case are that Dr. Guess was a family
practitioner that also practiced, I guess, in the late eighties, homeopathic medicine. And the evidence was that he was the only homeopathic practitioner that was licensed by the Medical Board in North Carolina at that time. I don't know if it's true, but that's what the -- that's what the case says.

And because Dr. Guess was practicing homeopathic medicine that was not practiced by any other medical practitioners at that time, it was held that he practiced below the standard of care and for that reason his license was taken away.

It went back and forth through the courts and the issue -- the burning issue was not, is there more than one standard of care. That wasn't even discussed.

What was discussed is whether or not the Medical Board in order to take Dr. Guess's license had to show harm. And the Medical Board made a specific finding that there was no harm to Dr. Guess's patients. They took his medical license anyway and in the earlier appeals to the Superior Court and the Court of Appeals, they reversed that decision. They said that we feel like you have to show harm.

And it got up to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court
said, no, the Medical Board can take away a practitioner's license if they find it's below the standard of care whether or not any patient is harmed.

Now, that was a controversial decision and there was a very strong dissent and the dissent was written by Justice Frye. And in that dissent he argued very strenuously for the opposite position. That's what we lawyers do, there's -- there's always two sides to every case and even in the Supreme Court of this state, there's two sides to every case.

And Justice Frye said that clearly the public policy of the state was to protect patients. If Dr. Guess was -- was the only homeopathic person -- practitioner in the state, there was nobody to compare him to any other homeopathic practitioner and so therefore on that basis hold that he was below the standard of care when no showing of patient harm was brought.

And he went on to say that the majority of the evidence of the legitimacy of homeopathy in other states and countries throughout the world as being irrelevant because homeopathy is not a currently accepted -- accepted and prevailing system of medical practice in North Carolina.

This raises the legitimate question of how the acceptable
and prevailing practice can be improved in North Carolina, if we do not even consider what happens in other states, so Dr. -- Justice Frye raised the question. And there was some change to the Medical Practice Act in 2003 that at least attempted to address and answer this question.

First of all, I want to go through some specific changes that are in the final statute, not in the draft that you have, but in the final statute and which are the law of North Carolina.

As we stated, but I want to emphasize, in 90-1.13 a definition was added recognizing that integrative medicine was a diagnostic or therapeutic treatment that may not be considered a conventionally accepted medical treatment. And a licensed physician in that position -- and that a licensed physician in the physician's professional opinion believes maybe a potential benefit to a patient, so long as the treatment posses no greater risk of harm to the patient than other comparable -- than the comparable conventional treatments. I'm sorry I'm having trouble reading this.

That was a change in the law that addresses the question of Dr. Guess's case, thirteen years later. And it
recognizes that there can be an integrative practice of medicine in North Carolina and you don't have to prove that every other doctor considers these practices, you know, or uses -- uses the practices in their practices or considers them, you know, opposites. What is says is that you can depart from the conventionally accepted -- accepted medical treatment and still practice integrative medicine in the state of North Carolina. That's critical here.

Now, we've also looked at the change in 90-14(a)(6) and 90-14 is the disciplinary authority of the Board and those are the 13 or -- no, I'm sorry, 15 things -- I guess it's actually 16 because there are to 11(a), things that this -- this Board can discipline a physician for. And Dr. Buttar has been charged under two of these. It's subsection 6 which is unprofessional conduct and subset -- subsection 12 which is exploitation of patients. So that is the law that you are considering in this case, whether or not he has violated either one of these provisions.

The definition is unprofessional conduct including, but not limited to, a departure from or failure to conform to the standards of a acceptable and prevailing medical practice or the ethics of the medical profession.
irrespective of whether or not a patient is injured thereby or committing any act contrary to honesty, justice, good morals, whether the same is committed in the course of the physician's practice or otherwise, and whether or not committed in the state of North Carolina.

That sentence must be read in the context of the entire statute. And when the Legislature added the provision that recognized integrative law -- integrative medicine, it specifically defined integrative medicine as a departure from the conventionally accepted medical treatment.

What do you do? How do you -- how do you make those two statutes go together? I submit to you, Doctors, that what you have to do is import the law that's well established in the state of North Carolina in the medical malpractice arena that says when a physician is judged, he or she should be judged by people in their own field of practice.

And I have some more evidence that I think the Legislature meant that when they -- when they made this change to the law.

If you will look at 90-14.6(b), I believe that was a change that was made at the same time in 2003. This is a section that deals with the evidence admissible at this hearing.
(b) says: Subject to the North Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure and Rules of Evidence in proceedings held pursuant to this article, the individual under investigation may call witnesses including medical practitioners licensed in the United States with training and experience in the same field of practice as the individual under investigation and familiar with the standard of care among members of the same healthcare profession in North Carolina.

The evidence to be considered by the Board that can be presented by these -- the practitioner under investigation is members in the same field of practice.

What we have presented to you today or today and yesterday is evidence from an integrative medicine doctor, Dr. Wilson, and an oncologist who also practices integrative medicine. They both testified that Dr. Buttar met the standard of care for a doctor practicing integrative medicine in the state of North Carolina in the treatment of these patients.

The question is, is Dr. Buttar held to the standard of an oncologist when he is clearly not an oncologist or is Dr. Buttar held to the standard of care of a doctor
practicing integrative medicine?
And I argue very strenuously that the latter should apply
based on the language -- on the clear language in the
statute and the laws of North Carolina as it has defined
the standard of care and based on fundamental fairness.
Again, the whole idea of the standard of care is that we
do not judge a family practitioner by the standards of
a neurosurgeon by diagnosis or treatment or anything else.
And you can say they look at different conditions, but
so many times doctors who are in more general fields, like
you Dr. Rhyne, or an internist or a family practice doctor,
see a wide variety of conditions. And should doctors in
the more general fields like Dr. Buttar who is an
integrative medicine be held to the same standard of care
as a specialist. Is that fair? We believe not.
Finally, and I don't want to overlook this, another section
was added that I need you to turn back -- and I hope you're
following with me on the numbers, it's 90-14 again,
subsection (g). That section was also added in 2003.
Again, I think a lot in reaction to the Guess case.
And that section says: Prior to taking action against
any licensee who practices integrative medicine for
providing care not in accordance with the standards of
practice with procedures or treatments administered, the
Board shall consult with a licensee who practices
integrative medicine.
Well, we brought that -- those people to you in this
hearing. And what they have told you is that Dr. Buttar
has met the standard of care.
Now, again, the Legislature has carved out and it's not
put integrative medicine doctors in a -- in a special
category, but again they did. Because I think in reactions
to the Guess case saying that there's conventional medicine
and then there is alternative medicine and that's clearly
recognized here, the right to practice integrative
medicine is clearly recognized here. We don't have, you
know, Dr. Guess being run out of town because there were
no other homeopaths by which to judge him.
The Legislature has mandated that you do recognize this
and that -- and we say that the law should be interpreted
that you judge Dr. Buttar by the standards of a doctor
practicing integrative medicine.
Now, we brought you the testimony of Dr. Buttar himself
to directly answer the criticism of Dr. Peterson and
it's -- it's pretty fundamental here. For conventional
medicine oncology, no more treatment was available for
these patients. They had all been refused treatment as many patients that Dr. Buttar treats. And if you judge him by the conventional standards, he should turn every patient away. He couldn't practice alternative medicine. But he sees medicine differently from the conventional practice of medicine and sees alternative medicine, I'm sure, differently from the way you practice medicine. He believes in different therapies and different theories of disease. And, again, no area of science has a monopoly on truth. I mean, if there's any example of that, it's the debate about will the climate change in global warming. You can find just as many good science -- scientists on either side of that debate no matter which side you are for. Does that mean, you know, there's -- there's one side that should be prevalence over another? We don't know yet. And that's how science progresses because some people think that things should be done differently. Sometimes they're right, and sometimes they're wrong, but they have the right to disagree with the established belief. That's how science progresses. And we say that Dr. Buttar has that right and we believe his patients have that right to get alternative treatments.
Again, I'm not going to rehash the medical evidence for you because you can see that yourself if you saw the many patients that he has helped and the various patients that believe in his treatment, believe they were helped by him. You met Dr. Buttar, he's not a snake oil salesman. He's not, as Justice Frye put it, this is not the case of a quack yelling in the public, but a dedicated physician seeking to find new ways to relieve human suffering. That's a quote from the Guess case and I think it's applicable here.

Dr. Buttar is a sincere, passionate individual who sees things I'm sure differently than you do in the practice of medicine. But the question is, are any of his patients harmed by his treatments? Are some of them helped? Well, you've seen evidence of that. You've heard it from him, you've seen it from the patients themselves.

And does he have the right and do his patients have the right to his treatment, his care? Even Dr. Peterson has to admit that in the four patient charts that he reviewed in the two hours that he reviewed them, that he could not see any physical harm to the patients.

The last thing I want to do is urge you to keep your decision here confined to the complaints that were before the Board,
Patients A, B, C and D.

We're heard a lot about Patient E, that complaint is not part of these proceedings. Mr. Jimison opened the door with that by saying I want to show a pattern of practice here, but what I really think is that when he decided not to call Patient D, the complaining witness in Patient D -- for whatever reason he decided not to call them, that he wanted some other evidence to put before the Board.

But what you have to remember is the charges here have nothing to do with Patient E. We've had no opportunity to investigate any charges for Patient E and more importantly the complaint that's brought before you doesn't include Patient E in this case, that's for another day.

And the question here is, in cases of Patient A, B and C, and to the extent that you want to consider Patient D, who I think really has sort of been abandoned by -- by the Board, did Dr. Buttar meet the standards of care for an integrative medicine doctor practicing medicine in the state of North Carolina for the relative periods. Patient A, B and C were cancer patients who had been turned away by conventional medicine. They were not roped into Dr. Buttar's practice with any kind of advertising, he
tried to be honest with them, he told -- he never made any promises to them except that he would try to help them. With what he has seen through -- treatments that he has seen empirical evidence that this practice and the practice of practitioners in the alternative medicine are successful with some patients.

With regard to Patient A, there was not one family member that was upset with Dr. Buttar. Not one family member. Dr. Herman, the person who did file the complaint, while she may have been very well intentioned, I think she files her complaint based on her interpretation of what was going on through somebody else's mouth. And what's amazing to me is, she had an employee with a mother who had been her patient, the patient was dying of cancer. She was hearing things that apparently disturbed her about the treatment of this patient and she did not even go to see her and she was home on the weekends. She didn't go to see her, didn't go to see her family, didn't go to see -- go to check anything out firsthand. Patient A wanted to be treated even when Dr. Buttar and his nurse felt that this really wasn't going to help her. Patient A wanted to continue treatment and it was their clinical judgment to honor her wishes. Just like Ripoll
said, when we're dying you don't have very many things you can control, but one of the things you can control is whether or not to be treated and how you're treated. Is that wrong?

Again, no complaint from Patient A's family even -- you know, they've had two years there to look back and to think about it. Had to subpoena her daughter to be here. The daughter did not want to be involved.

Patient B, the complaint -- again, we heard Patient B had a daughter that she loved very much apparently according to the testimony. She was the sole heir of the estate.

As we hear it -- do we even see Patient B's daughter here complaining? Do we see anybody who is on the scene with Patient B complaining? No. The complaint comes from a nephew in Los Angeles who was not here at all when Patient B was being treated.

Did the Medical Board go out and find any firsthand witnesses that were over here when Patient B was being treated, the fiance we've heard so much about? No. It all comes in through somebody who through time and distance really didn't know, really didn't take time to investigate what was going on with that patient.

And, again, Patient B is a different case. It appears
that, you know, she really didn't want to do this treatment after a while and she withdrew from the treatment and that was fine. She was not a compliant patient and the practice released her. Nobody tried to rope her in for more therapy when she wasn't doing what Dr. Buttar said she needed to do.

Finally, Patient C, the complaint was by his wife, but we've heard a lot of testimony about the dynamics of that family situation. It's clear that Patient C's wife was not supportive at all of this treatment while every bit of evidence you have was that Patient C wanted to pursue this treatment and indeed other treatments -- other alternative treatments in Mexico.

Patient C, and all of these patients, were intelligent, informed, capable of making their own treatment decisions. And it was his decision to continue on with Dr. Buttar's treatment and then to seek other treatment in an effort to do something to help his -- his disease.

Now, finally, you know, a lot has been said about safety and -- and efficacy. Again, where that comes into play is if you were to decide that Dr. Buttar practiced below the standard of care, then if you were to decide that his license should be taken, you would have to make a finding
that the treatments that he gave were either less -- well, let me -- let me get the statute and I'll read it to you because I'm not going to try to recall that by memory at 20 minutes till 7.

Under 90-14 -- I'm sorry, (6) it says: The Board shall not revoke the license or deny a license to a person solely because that practice -- that -- or that person's practice of a therapy that is experimental, nontraditional, or that departs from the acceptable and prevailing medical practices unless by competent evidence, the Board can establish that the treatment has a safety risk that is greater than the prevailing treatment or that the treatment is generally not effective.

Okay. And I'm going to go over the issues with you that we say you should decide. They're not very different than Mr. Jimison's issues. But the way this works is, if you make a finding that Dr. Buttar has departed from the standard of practice and you recommend a disciplinary measure, if that disciplinary measure were to be a really -- a patient one, you would have to make a specific finding of one of these things.

Now, I want to ask, rhetorically, suppose Dr. Buttar's position and Dr. Peterson's positions were reversed and
Dr. Peterson as an oncologist were brought before you?

Suppose you were the alternative medical board and Dr. Peterson who is a conventional practitioner were brought before you for treating patients with chemotherapy and that is different from alternative practices. Would Dr. Peterson's treatment pass this same test?

Would Dr. Peterson's treatments, chemotherapy, conventional therapy for cancer patients pass the test that they are -- have the safety risk -- or that they do not have a safety risk greater than the -- than the alternative treatment. There's lots of toxic side effects to the risks to chemotherapy -- it is far more risky than anything Dr. Buttar is doing.

What about efficacy? Conventional treatments for cancer were generally effective, there would be no need for alternative treatments. But the fact is, that's one area of medical practice that is just in its infancy. And do we shut off alternative treatments just because they're different? What we're here to do is seek doctors to treat and to help patients and, of course, to do no harm.

Can we say at this stage of development of cancer treatments that conventional medicine offers to a patient a treatment that is so effective that there's no reason to go to
alternative therapies? I think not.
I think the General Assembly has specifically recognized
that alternative medicine -- or that integrative medicine
and the alternative medicine part of that should be
recognized in the state of North Carolina by the North
Carolina Medical Board and respected and be judged by the
standards of a doctor practicing integrative medicine,
not by the standards of an oncologist in these cases.
Thank you very much for your generous attention. You have
been just amazing in your attention with all the -- all
the medical records and the patients and the witnesses.
I thank you very much and so does Dr. Buttar. I know
your decision will be well considered and I ask, as does
Dr. Buttar, that your decision be in favor of him.
We have separate -- we have two sets of issues here for
the Board to decide. The only difference between our
issues and Mr. Jimison's issues are that we ask that you
apply a standard of care for a doctor practicing
integrative medicine in the standard of care question.
The issues are attached to the pre-trial stipulation --
pre-hearing stipulation that you all have.
Mr. Jimison's issues, I want to make sure I get this
straight, are Exhibit F. Our issues are Exhibit G. They
are identical with the exception of the one change in the first issue.

We say the proper question for you to answer is, Did Dr. Buttar depart from or fail to conform with the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice for a physician practicing integrative medicine and commit -- and commit unprofessional conduct within the meaning of the statute.

We say the answer to that question should be no.

Question 3 is, Did Dr. Buttar provide services to patients in a manner as to exploit the patient within the meaning of 90-14(a)(12).

And none of these patients were exploited. There's no evidence of it. We don't even think that's an issue that should take you very long. You know, they all were fairly informed of their rights, their abilities to pay or not pay. There's no exploitation there and we say that should be answered no.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you, Ms. Godfrey.

Mr. Jimison, would you like to make a closing statement?

MR. JIMISON: Yes, Madame President. And initially I'd like to hand up what's a Memorandum of Law. Some of the
other staff helped to prepare it while I was doing this. And here's a copy to Ms. Godfrey and to the Members of the Board. I'll be referring to it in my closing remarks. And thanks to Mr. Mansfield for helping us on that issue with this.

**CLOSING STATEMENT BY MR. JIMISON:**

I'd like to start off with a point of agreement with Ms. Godfrey. I do think the Board Members have been amazing in your attention to this, your patience, your endurance. I know these are not easy things to sit through. And I know there's been a lot of back and forth and give and take, and some of it between counsel. And I'd like to again share in agreement with Ms. Godfrey that -- and because you've not mentioned this, I think it was implied, the case is not about the lawyers. It's not about, you know, Ms. Godfrey, it's not about Mr. Knox or myself. It's about the facts and the evidence and the law. That's the only thing that matters here: the facts, the evidence and the law.

Some of it's not disputed in the facts. In fact, the court facts are not disputed at all. There are three patients -- there were four patients charged and I think everyone is focusing in on the three cancer patients.
There are three patients who came in to Dr. Buttar's office with late stage metastatic cancer. The cancers are of different types: adrenal, ovarian and cervical. Some had spread to the liver and the lungs, these people were dying and they were going to die.

There was testimony solicited from this Board that no one -- I don't think there was any patient that Dr. Buttar refused to treat even though they were at very late stages of their lives.

And the undisputed facts, I think really are shown, if you step aside instead of backwards is that he administered -- although they all came with different types of cancers, he administered a single one-size fits all therapy, oxygen therapy from hydrogen peroxide to ozone to hyperbaric chambers, chelation therapy.

And the Board Members solicited information -- elicited information from testimony that 100 percent or close to a 100 percent, virtually everyone comes in with some metal toxicity. And the Board pondered whether or not that made sense.

Dr. Peterson testified and I don't think there's any real disagreement there from listening to Ms. Godfrey's arguments, it only sounded as though she conceded that
these treatments were not within the standard of care of prevailing and acceptable practice of medicine for the treatment of cancer in North Carolina.

So the argument she made, and she spent most of the time on, was that this had to be judged by a different standard. That's not the law. It's clearly not the law and I will turn to that now.

When Mr. Mansfield did his rebuttal evidence, he showed you two pieces of legislation. The first legislation which was your Exhibit 26 was a proposed bill that essentially would have said that in order for you -- and this is 90-14(a)(6) and this is Exhibit 26, page 3. And this was additional language added to 90-14(a)(6) which is the charge for which Dr. Buttar is facing today.

That in order to find that a doctor departed from acceptable -- from standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice, you had to judge them by the standards of practice in any specialty, including complimentary treatment, shall be defined by specialists in that field.

And then this is actually very important, too. The next sentence: The Board shall not -- and you see the underline -- annul, suspend, revoke the license or deny a license
to a person, harass, or initiate an investigation solely because that person's practice of a therapy that's experimental, nontraditional or departs from acceptable standards.

That language as was shown on the rebuttal testimony did not make it to the final version of the bill.

The law which has been handed up to and I'll read it from, you know, the big official book is the following:

Unprofessional conduct, including, but not limited to, departure from, or the failure to conform to, the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice, or the ethics of the medical profession, and I'll skip some of this -- well, let me just read it.

Unprofessional conduct includes, but not limited to, departure from, or the failure to conform to, the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice, irrespective of whether or not a patient is injured thereby, or the committing of any act contrary to honesty, justice, or good morals, whether the same is committed in the course of the physician's practice or otherwise, and whether committed within or without North Carolina.

That law -- that sentence is the exact same law that the
Supreme Court upheld in the George Guess case. And we had an argument yesterday and I know it's been essentially four days crammed into two, but if I can remind the Board Members, the North Carolina Supreme Court said we conclude that the Legislature in enacting 90-14(a)(6) -- the very statute that is the basis of the charges that is before you today, and that was considered in this case -- the Supreme Court said that the Legislature in enacting this law reasonably believed that a general risk of danger to public is inherent in any practices -- and any is italicized and emphasized -- which failed to conform to the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice in North Carolina.

We further conclude that the legislative intent was to prohibit any practice departing from acceptable and prevailing medical standards without regard to whether the particular practice itself could be shown to endanger the public. Our conclusion is buttressed by the plain language of the statute which allows the Board to act against any -- and again they emphasize any -- departure from acceptable medical practice irrespective of whether or not a patient is injured thereby.

And by authorizing the Medical Board to prevent or punish
any -- and again it's emphasized -- medical practice departing from acceptable and prevailing standards, irrespective of whether a patient is injured thereby, the statute works as a regulation which tends to secure the public generally against the consequences of ignorance and incapacity as well as deception and fraud, even though it may not immediately have that direct fact in that particular case.

That was the law when Dr. Guess's case went to the North Carolina Supreme Court. Dr. Guess was a homeopathic physician who was practicing beyond the standard of care for the patients that he was treating, the Medical Board brought in doctors to say this was not within the standard of practice. He was saying no -- none of these doctors are homeopaths, I'm basically the only homeopath doctor in North Carolina, you have to judge me by homeopathic standards.

And the North Carolina Supreme Court specifically rejected that -- that interpretation. They specifically rejected that -- that law or that proposed meaning of the laws. And then when the North Carolina General Assembly considered changing the law to include some information about integrative medicine and we had this bill that was
proposed which talks about you have to judge them by the standards of practice in any specialty, including complimentary treatment, shall be defined by specialists in that field, the General Assembly specifically rejected that and did not include it in the law.

And also when they added that whether the Board can do certain discipline against certain doctors if they depart, they only left in -- they only left in revocation.

So when the law was changed to include the next sentence:

The Board shall not revoke the license of or deny a license to a person solely because of that person's practice of a therapy that is experimental, nontraditional or it departs from acceptable -- or that departs from acceptable and prevailing medical practices unless by competent evidence the Board can establish that the treatment has a safety risk greater than the prevailing treatment or that the treatment is generally not effective, they -- they kept that language in and they pinned it to -- they pinned it to only revocation.

And when they actually tried to expand the law to include other acts of discipline, they specifically refused to include other acts of discipline. They pinned it solely to revocation.
So in the event you find that Dr. Buttar departed from acceptable and prevailing medical practices for the treatment of cancer, and I think it's undisputed that he did, then the only time this law comes into effect -- the only time that this law becomes relevant is if the Board decides it wants to revoke Dr. Buttar's license. And if the Board decides it wants to revoke Dr. Buttar's license, then and only then, are you required to make a finding of whether or not the safety risk was greater than the prevailing treatment or that it was generally ineffective.

I would submit that if you get to that point that you can actually make the finding that it was generally ineffective from Dr. Peterson's testimony. The only testimony that actually went by treatment to treatment, procedure by procedure, and asked what was the efficacy, the scientific research based, evidence based efficacies for all these treatments for cancer and his answer for each and every one of them was zero.

And -- and all the witnesses -- and not just to put it all on Dr. Peterson -- I think even from the other side that came to -- when it came to defending these treatments on the basis of evidence based, scientific research based...
research regarding clinical trials showing the efficacies
of these treatments to a person, even Dr. Buttar's own
witnesses said there is none, said there is no -- no
acceptable and prevailing recognized scientific evidence
based research showing the efficacies of these treatments.
And I believe the Board elicited testimony about how this
was somewhat putting the cart before the horse, that he's
doing these treatments without having any research, having
had any scientific basis for doing it. He just thinks
it may be good.
So I'd now like to return you to the other section of the
statute where in 90-(a), the General Assembly again was
asked to -- and this is on page 2, if you flip back to
page 2 of Exhibit 26.
The General Assembly was asked to consider whether or not
medical expert witnesses called by the Board including
medical practitioners licensed in the United States must
routinely and actively practice in the specialty that is
under investigation by the Board.
And then it goes on to talk about each party must make
certain disclosures. But the key part of that was the
first sentence I read about the medical expert witnesses
must routinely and actively practice in the specialty that
is under investigation by the Board.

Again, they specifically rejected that language. They specifically rejected that language. And what they ended up with was 90-14(g) where it says: Prior to taking action against any licensee who practices integrative medicine for providing care not in accordance with the standards of practice for the procedures or treatments administered, the Board shall consult with a licensee who practices integrative medicine.

That has been done. There has been no argument from Dr. Buttar that there has been no consultation.

And it's interesting to note the choice of the word consult. It does not say that the integrative medicine practitioner must testify in front of the Board. It does not say that the Medical Board must agree with the consultation. It just simply says that prior to issuing charges that you must consult with an integrative medicine practitioner.

And, again, there has not been any argument from the other side, nor could there be, that that has not been done because that has been done.

And if you look at the -- you know, 90-(a)(g) they used the word testify. So not only was that language about medical expert witnesses must be of the same specialty,
but they talked about testifying. And here not only did they not adopt that language, but when they included some additional language in 90-14(a)(g), they changed it to merely consult, which again has been done.

So I will circle back and go back to what I always like to do which is to find realms of agreement. Ms. Godfrey said, and the argument has been made, that you should only judge the case, this present case, on the law that exists on the books now. And the law on the books that exists now is the law that was applied in the Dr. Guess case. The only change that was made is that in order to revoke Dr. Buttar's license that you have make certain findings, they specifically rejected broadening that to include any other disciplinary action besides revocation and they put -- they specifically rejected any requirement that there be an integrative medicine doctor practice -- an integrative medicine doctor testify in any of these proceedings.

So the Board's case to me reflects essentially what the General Assembly was trying to say which is that if a medical practitioner -- and -- and I think this is actually revealing, if you look at 90-14(a)(6), the word integrative medicine does not appear in 90-14(a)(6). You cannot find
the word integrative medicine in 90-14(a)(6).

And what the -- the medical -- the General Assembly was saying is that any practitioner cannot come into -- cannot come to North Carolina, start practicing medicine, start treating a whole -- you know, a whole slew of different illness, diseases and not do it in a way that's acceptable and follows prevailing medical standards and then escape any sort of regulation from this Board by attaching a name to it, call it integrative, call it nontraditional, call it experimental.

So long as the practitioner has slapped a name to it, then this Medical Board cannot -- cannot regulate it. That would give medical practitioners free reign to do whatever they want without any regulations from this Board.

In essence, it would nullify the need for a medical board at all. Because if you found a doctor departed from acceptable and prevailing standards in the treatment of certain patients for certain conditions, the doctor can then say, whoa, whoa, I'm -- you know, I'm this kind of practitioner.

You can't look at me and before you -- and if you do look at me, you're going to have to find someone who calls themselves exactly what I call myself and they're going
to have to testify that what I'm doing has no effect and -- and hurts people. Basically creating an impossible burden for you to take any action against any practitioner so long as he's just attached a label to what he did.

And the North Carolina General Assembly, when it created -- this Board was created -- you were created to protect the public health. And if that was the case that anybody could just slap a label on what they're doing, then the public health is endangered and that's what the North Carolina General Assembly was -- I mean, the North Carolina Supreme Court was saying in the Guess case.

So that is why the General Assembly rejected those provisions, because it just doesn't make sense. And that is not the law today. I mean, again, I circle back to the agreement I have with Ms. Godfrey, you should judge this on what the law is today.

In other cases, I mean for instance, they say to make -- they make an argument that, well, if different doctors of different specialties are doing certain things, then you should only judge them by the doctors -- the doctor who is accused of doing it wrong, but I know a doctor who does it like him.

The Medical Board has historically never done that. In
the case of Dr. Talley, Dr. Talley was a family practice
doctor out of Shelby who was practicing pain medication,
chronic pain -- chronic pain treatments in using abundant
Schedule II narcotics to treat chronic pain and was doing
it in a way that was just completely unacceptable.
The Board's expert witness in that case was Dr. Roth.
Dr. Roth was a board certified research-based, I believe
university-based anesthesiologist. And the reason we had
a board certified university-based anesthesiologist
review Dr. Talley's work and testify against him is because
Dr. Talley was practicing chronic pain medicine.
And if you're going to practice chronic pain medicine,
you will be judged by the standards of practicing chronic
pain medicine. If you're going to do surgery -- if you're
a family practice doctor and you're going to operate on
a patient, you know, assuming somehow you're able to get
privileges in a hospital somewhere or do so in your office,
you're going to be judged by the standard of that surgeon.
And to do so, to judge them by some other standard saying
you cannot judge this doctor for doing surgery unless you
find another specialty in his practice, will endanger the
public health. And that's why these interpretations --
that's why these proposed laws were specifically and
out-of-hand rejected.
And I'd like to expound on this just a little bit more
and I know the night -- the time of night is getting long,
but it goes back to what the meaning of standards are.
If standards are relegated to the subjective beliefs of
individuals, then they no longer become standards, but
that's not to mean that standards are rigid. They are
subject to evolution and progress.
Modern medicine makes -- progresses all the time and it
does so in way that is responsible. It does so through
clinical trails, Phase I, Phase II, you know, institutional
review boards, university settings. And the reason those
protocols and safeguards are there, these standards are
there, is because they protect the public.
When medicine has -- has strayed from those safeguards,
then that is when medicine has been denigrated. And the
denigrations of medicine in history are known by single
words, Peskidy, Stonybrook. And the reason that we have
these standards are because they are there to protect the
individual.
And at this point, you know, I'm just trying to pause and
say that, you know, it's been, you know, a long day. You
know, it's been, you know, many depositions, many hours
of preparation and at times, you know, all of this gets funneled through one person and I feel, you know -- you know, humbled and awed and scared, frankly, by trying to sum up everything that all the resources of this Medical Board that gets put into these cases, that get investigated in these cases, and it gets funneled through essentially one person and that person is me and, you know, you just don't want to flub it up, so -- but -- you know, but I'll try not to.

But in this case what you end up finding is that the evidence is overwhelming. The only evidence you have in front of you, and again I go back to judge it by the facts which seem to be undisputed about the patients who came and saw Dr. Buttar and what they got, what therapies they got, the law which I've explained and -- and the evidence. The only evidence you have about the standard of care for the treatment of these cancer patients came from Dr. Peterson. He looked at these therapies and he saw them having no benefit, no benefit whatsoever. He saw these -- these therapies and said, this is not cancer therapies. It's just not how you treat cancer. And that's the only evidence on the standard of care, the acceptable and prevailing medical practice in North Carolina. That's
the only thing you have in front of you.
Dr. Buttar seems to be making the argument and they kept phrasing the question in front of their witnesses is that, well, is Dr. Buttar performing to the standard of care for an integrative medicine practitioner. Again, not to repeat myself, but that's the incorrect standard. These patients all have metastatic Stage IV advanced cancer. They were all dying and -- and Dr. Buttar was treating them for their cancer.
Not a single person from their side, Dr. Buttar included, Dr. Ripoll from Colorado, Dr. Wilson who testified today, and Dr. Biddle who did not even testify today, not a single one testified that Dr. Buttar was within the acceptable and prevailing standard of medical practice for the treatment of late stage cancer patients. Not a single one.
So the only evidence you have of the applicable standard of care, which these people came to Dr. Buttar for, the only evidence you have is from Dr. Peterson and your own expert opinion.
That's the other thing about medical boards, you are doctors. You can apply your own -- your own sense of what the acceptable and prevailing standards of medicine are
to this case.

But to go back to Dr. Peterson, only Dr. Peterson -- not only did he say that the care was not within the standard of care, but he characterized it in very strong terms. And I really don't need to repeat those -- those terms here. And why did he use such strong language when -- when he -- when he opined about this being outside the standard of care?

And the reason is, is because he's a scientist. He is an oncologist. He treats hundreds of patients a year. He sees the highs and lows of this horrible disease. He was on the faculty at UNC. He is board certified in oncology and hematology. He goes to several conferences a year. He subscribes to journals and he reads and he stays current.

And he went through every single one of those therapies and looked at them and said, not a single one was effective.

And every witness on their side, again, testified that not only were these therapies not effective that's proven through clinical trials and research for cancer, but they were also not approved or shown to have any effect for boosting the immune system. And this whole notion of
boosting the immune system, there again sort of lies the heart of the issue in 90-14(a)(12).

When the curtain started getting pulled back on what we were seeing with Dr. Buttar, at some point it became, well, I'm not treating cancer any more. I'm just trying to boost the immune system, how the immune system has some effect, and that would drive the cancer away. And -- and that was sort of how he was sort of explaining his -- his treatments and -- and saying that the cancer was only a symptom of an impaired immune system.

And we heard that over the past two days and -- and -- and what is interesting about it, and I won't go too long on this, is that -- let's look at the address -- let's look at the facts in the address. Dr. Buttar's clinic holds itself out as specializing in cancer treatment. He has a seminar that he -- that he goes to and he has the brochure which says Integrative Protocols for the Treatment of Cancer. His consent form which he makes a lot to do about talks about, in the consent form, he treats cancer.

When Ms. Garcia was on the stand and she talked about Patient A she wrote in her note, Patient A to -- to think about whether she will proceed with the cancer protocol.
And if you go through all the other progress notes, you will see it mentions about the cancer protocol, the cancer protocol. Not the immunology protocol, not the immune system protocol, but the cancer protocol. And this is where we sort of get this -- this sort of -- this sort of thing about 90-14(a)(12) about providing services in the manner that exploits the patients.

These patients are coming to Dr. Buttar in their darkest hours. They're dying, they're going to die and -- and they're -- they're signing all kinds of paperwork and they're willing to give over a lot of money, $1,000 a day, you know, several days a week, tens of thousands of dollars, when it's all said and done. They're not doing that because their immune -- to get their immune system up. They're doing that because they think he can help them with their cancer.

The patients testified about the fact that he could help them with their cancer. Ms. Garcia's note talks about the cancer protocols. No one is going to give over ten thousand -- tens of thousands of dollars on a bet that the immune system is going to be boosted and that their cancer is there and somehow going to go away from that.
He's being -- the patients who testified by video, they searched for him on the Internet, they have cancer, they find him. His -- like I said, his -- his literature that goes out, he specializes in cancer. And there's a -- I mean, even though they talk about how educated these patients are and how -- and how informed they are, no matter how smart you are, no matter how informed you are, if you're in late stage cancer, there's a power differential. There's a power differential between a patient and her loved ones or his loved ones, you know, dealing with cancer and then sitting down in front of a doctor with your Medical Board license hanging on the wall and him telling you that he can do something, he can help you with your cancer. That has a -- that has a persuasive influential effect on patients that no matter how informed the patients are, no matter how educated they are, you are just going to put your trust into that. And in exchange -- and in defense of that from your side, what we got essentially were, you know, these therapies are administered in such a way and -- and that when -- and when these therapies are administered, there's accusations that the -- that the Medical Board is -- you know, the medical boards are out to do this, the
pharmaceutical companies are out to do this, the patients are unhappy about paying their bills and -- and there's marital strife and -- and that a doctor, Dr. Herman, you know, didn't go see the patient while she was dying. Who -- who can tell Dr. Herman that what she did was wrong? Her -- her employee was sitting -- who she works with, her mother is dying of cancer, she's going to get therapies that Dr. Herman felt were so outside of the mainstream that she felt motivated to complain to the Medical Board and she's mocked. She's mocked for not visiting her daughter -- or her daughter's mother. Patients are mocked because, you know, there was marital strife or that they just don't want to pay bills. And when I think about these sort of defenses, these sort of responses, you know, it's reminiscent of, you know, Macbeth's famous soliloquy that Shakespeare wrote that life is just sound and fury and signifies nothing. These defenses, these -- these responses is just nothing but sound and fury and it signifies nothing. What it does signify is that there is -- somewhere there is -- there is a loved one that's going to Dr. Buttar's office, they're dying, and they would be looking for any glimmer of hope.
And Dr. Buttar is more than willing to give them that
glimmer of hope, but it's all false hope and they will
be set up to IVs, getting eight hours a day of treatment,
five days a week, paying him tens of thousands of dollars,
and the whole time there's a North Carolina medical license
on his wall.
And if this is allowed to continued, if this is allowed
to go on, that is your stamp of approval. His medical
license is your stamp of approval. So if this goes on,
then anyone can come into North Carolina and take this
Dr. Buttar case because it will then become legal precedent
and say, I can do whatever I want, follow no standards,
so long as I put a label on it there's nothing this Medical
Board can do.
That is not the facts, that's the law and that's not the
evidence. It is nothing but sound and fury and it's time
to stand up to that sound and fury and if you do, there's
nothing untoward that will happen. This is the time to
stand up for science-based, evidence-based medicine. And
if you do so, there will not -- nothing -- not only will
nothing untoward happen to this Board, it will be this
Board's finest hour.
I ask you to look at the two issues and Exhibit F which
is my issue that says: Did Dr. Buttar depart from or fail to conform to the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice.

The evidence, the facts, the law clearly says he does -- he did. That has to be answered yes.

As to whether he exploited patients in a manner under 90-14(a)(12), I just remind you of that power differential.

These patients were in their darkest hours. So I will respectfully submit that the Board answer the interrogatories yes and that we proceed to Phase II.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you. The Board will now go into closed session to consider the evidence and then we'll announce the decision.

MR. KNOX: Madame Chairman, I would like to except two things. One is the placing of the -- of the Board in the position of saying that you have put your stamp of approval on or take it off, that's all -- that you're supposed to argue to a jury or to you.

And to the extent that he supplemented the record by saying who had reviewed certain data. I would take exception to those two and that's all I have to say.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. I want to make sure I have a copy
of the pre-hearing agreement.

MR. JIMISON: Okay. I'll give you mine, Dr. Rhyne.

MS. GODFREY: I have a copy here if you need it.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. Let me get you --

MS. GODFREY: I'll get another one.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: I've got so many sheets of paper to go through them --

MS. GODFREY: I understand your problem.

(WHEREUPON, THE PANEL RECESSED INTO
EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:18 P.M.
AND RECONVENED AT 7:58 P.M.)

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Our concern is with questions five and six. Is that a Phase II and do we have to go into Phase II or do we answer those now?

MR. JIMISON: I would recommend going into Phase II.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: And what --

DR. McCULLOCH: And we have different questions, yeah.

MS. GODFREY: -- what is meant by Phase II? I don't know --

MR. MANSFIELD: Well, that's --
PRESIDENT RHYNE: That was our --

MR. MANSFIELD: The parallel in a civil case would be, this is the negligent -- you know, the equivalent of a negligence, but it's not negligence, but it's equivalent of a negligence phase. And they they come back again and answer the questions, did misconduct occur. If the answer is yes, then and only then, it's Phase II which is the appropriate discipline phase.

MS. GODFREY: Well, is there more evidence given?

MR. MANSFIELD: You can -- you are permitted to -- and the way we do it is you can present more witnesses, documents, evidence in support of your argument about what you think the discipline ought to be.

MR. KNOX: To the full Board you're talking about?

MR. MANSFIELD: No, to this panel.

MS. GODFREY: This panel. We're still in this --

MR. MANSFIELD: This panel is going to make a recommendation as to the initial questions of misconduct --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right.

MR. MANSFIELD: -- and the appropriate punishment.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: And the way I understand it and you correct me if I'm wrong, is that we can do that tonight or we can do it another time. And I guess part of my
question about that is, do you guys want to do it tonight at this time or if you were going to do that and present more evidence, you have --

MS. GODFREY: Well, I don't think --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- more evidence, no more evidence. We have a court reporter we're looking at and we're prepared to stay.

COURT REPORTER: I am here at your pleasure.

MR. JIMISON: I was just going to make an argument about --

I just want to make an argument and not present evidence.

I'm not going to put a time limit on it, but it was not going to be long.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yes, sir. Do you -- do you think -- could each side do it in ten minutes?

MR. KNOX: No.

MS. GODFREY: No. I mean, understand, Dr. Rhyne, the procedures here are not something that, you know, we deal with every day. And the -- you know, if you're saying that we're going to consider more evidence, I mean, we would consider more evidence on the issue of penalty. I don't see how we can possibly be prepared to address that, you know, at this point.

We -- we put on our case with regard to, you know, to the
charges, but I mean the issue of penalty is -- is something that, you know, we're going to have a chance to submit additional evidence. And -- and that may be, you know, in the form of -- I know there's disciplinary guidelines that we would need to look at, as you would need to look at and -- and maybe even some of the cases we've reported, so.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, I think the Board should be fair. Every time we conduct one of these hearings, the Board should be fair and I would suggest that you use that as your guide to make a decision about this.

On the other hand, I would advocate for pressing ahead and finishing this case for several reasons. And I don't have the pre-hearing stipulation in front of me, but I believe that the penalty issues are in your issues, that's the pre-hearing agreement that we embarked on this hearing with, including the penalty phase issues.

And we have, you know, and what we normally do as -- as Madame President knows, is we forge ahead because folks come prepared to try the case and the parallel and in civil court is you come to prepared to try on liability and damages at the same time.

So I certainly -- if you think it's unfair to Dr. Buttar
because his attorneys are not in a position to go forward, then you should make whatever decision you think is right. On behalf of Marcus and me, I would advocate for going ahead and conducting Phase II, reminding the Board that this -- you know, you're a panel making a recommendation.

The final decision in this case is already not going to occur until I would anticipate July and to -- to have to come back and do Phase II at another time and further delay the final decision in this case, seems like a poor use of judicial resources of the Board which the hearing time, as you know, is very limited.

MR. KNOX: May I be heard? This whole thing has been sort of like -- okay. If you could listen just a minute. We were told initially we would have a hearing before the Board. We were -- told them there was no way we could get ready -- I think we were notified --

MS. GODFREY: You mean, the charges?

MR. KNOX: Yes.

MS. GODFREY: In December.

MR. KNOX: -- in December and the hearing was supposed to have been in --

MS. GODFREY: February.
MR. KNOX: -- February. And I said, there's no way, I'm in trial in a lot of -- in a lot of cases. So then it was set to be heard today. And then we were told we would have a panel and then we were told that it couldn't be continued. Then we were told that it would be continued unless we took off some of our experts. So we talk about fairness and I appreciate what he said, I think he means it. I think in fairness to our client, he ought to have the opportunity -- I'm sorry for you to come back, but on the other hand, I have not consulted -- on the issues you've answered and I'm not asking you to tell me, but I think in fairness we ought not to be put in that position, not at this late hour.

MR. MANSFIELD: Well, if I may just address two points specifically that Mr. Knox mentioned. The charges that were issued in this case in December specified that this case would be heard either before a panel or the full Board, so notice was given from the get-go that it could be before a panel.

And unless Mr. Knox or Ms. Godfrey tells me I'm wrong, my belief is that there has been no request for a discussion about a continuance from this setting. I mean, I can perfectly well understand why they didn't try the case
in February based on the charges coming out in December.

But --

MR. KNOX: Well, I don't think you've been privy to that.

We did say to Marcus and Marcus said to me, I don't think there's a chance that the Board is going to put this off.

And I said, I don't know how in the world we can get ready and in that short of a period of time and we were told it's going to be tried. And then Marcus said, we will try it if you eliminate some of our experts which we did and I think you wanted me to move expeditiously just as Marcus has tried to move expeditiously. But in fairness to our client, it was a big issue, quite obviously. That's all I have to say.

MR. JIMISON: You know, historically we can move straight to Phase II. And Dr. McCulloch and Dr. Rhyne, I think you have more experience than Dr. Walker. You know, historically we've always sort of moved to Phase II. And, again, my -- my -- my presentation would be mostly just what the discipline should be based on whatever here -- what you say the issues were in three and -- and that could go very, very briefly.

The other point is that this is just a recommendation and if there's any more argument they want to make, that either
a -- the decision of the panel or the decision -- or the recommended sanction is something that's not warranted, they can do that in front of the full Board.

DR. WALKER: So what you're -- excuse me.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go right ahead.

DR. WALKER: So what you're saying is that if we render a Phase II decision that that would be the recommendation of the Panel to the full Board and Mr. Knox and Ms. Godfrey will have an opportunity to present to the full Board.

MS. GODFREY: No more evidence.

MR. MANSFIELD: Correct. Let me hasten to clarify that they would not be able to bring witnesses or additional documents at that time. They would need to do that in Phase II before this Panel. They would get to present arguments that the punishment was excessive or that the first decision was wrong to the quorum of the Board.

MR. JIMISON: However, typically the evidence and I will make an objection to this in front of the Board Panel -- before the quorum of the Board is that's normally what the Board had done in similar cases in the past. I mean, the Board can always take judicial notice of what they did in similar cases in the past and that's typically the type of evidence the Board would receive.
So, again, I agree with Tom, whatever you, Dr. Rhyne, and the members of the Panel believe is fair. I'm not going to -- I don't know if I'm contradicting my boss, but I'm not going to jump up and down about it.

MR. KNOX: Dr. Walker, the only thing I can say, that assumes anything we might say or prepare could be appreciated or changed or modified now and so I do think that in fairness of the doctor, he ought to have a chance to do that. And I was -- I thought you made a recommendation to the -- to the full Board, but I didn't know you made a recommendation today. I'm sorry, I should have known. I've been down here on several occasions, but they are more casual appearing than the Panel.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Can we go back into closed session --

MR. MANSFIELD: Sure, no problem.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- and we'll make a decision and then call you back --

MS. GODFREY: Okay.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- but thank you.

(WHEREUPON, THE PANEL RECESSED INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 8:08 P.M.

AND RECONVENED AT 8:15 P.M.)
PRESIDENT RHYNE: The Board considered the issues and on the proposed issues:

Number 1. Did Dr. Buttar fail -- depart from or fail to conform to the standards of acceptable and prevailing medical practice and, thus, commit unprofessional conduct within the meaning of North Carolina General Statute 90-14(a)(6) in which he treated Patients A through C. We've excluded D.

The answer was yes.

Number 3. Did Dr. Buttar provide services to patients in such a manner as to exploit the patients within the meaning of General Statute -- North Carolina General Statute 90-14(a)(12).

The answer was yes.

PHASE II

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Now, the decision is to go into -- go ahead and go into Phase II. And since we found that he -- Dr. Buttar committed a violation of the Medical Practice Act, we must proceed to Phase II and determine an appropriate disposition.

MR. KNOX: I assume you would begin with the Medical Board
-- I mean, the Board.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Would you like -- do you want to present other witnesses, exhibits or be heard on that?

MR. KNOX: I've indicated --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Or to question anyone.

MR. KNOX: I'm not prepared to do so, so if you want to go ahead hear what they have to say --

MS. GODFREY: Well --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Ms. Godfrey, would you like to present any witnesses, exhibits or otherwise be heard on the question of the penalty.

CLOSING STATEMENT BY MS. GODFREY:

Well, I think -- I think we would like to be heard. I think that the Board is now in the phase of considering the disciplinary guidelines and I think we ought to at least address that because it's very clear that some of them apply and some of them don't apply.

And so practicing below the minimum standard of care is the one charge.

And I must admit that in the disciplinary guidelines, I don't see any guidelines with respect to the second charge that specifically say with regard to exploitation of patients, so I'm not quite sure how to proceed with that.
But with regard to practicing below the minimum standard of care as published by the Board, the presumptive maximum is revocation of the license, presumptive minimum is stayed suspension of the license.

The aggravating factors that you can consider in deciding which of those or, I assume, any remedy in between are the prior disciplinary actions. There's been none. Patient harm, none.

Dishonest or selfish motive, I don't think any dishonest or selfish motive was proven. I think all the evidence is that Dr. Buttar was doing what he thought was best for his patients.

Position of false evidence, false statement or other deceptive practices during the disciplinary process, no evidence of that.

Vulnerability of the victim, we would say that these were all competent adults and perfectly capable of making decisions on their own for their own medical treatment.

There's no children involved in these charges. There's no incompetent people involved in these charges. These were all people that were in their right mind. They happen to be suffering from cancer, but they were still all in
their right minds and they could do -- make decisions on
their own.

Refusal to admit wrongful nature of conduct. That's a
tough one because as I argued to the Board, Dr. Buttar
does not believe that his conduct was wrongful. And if
that's held against him, I think that's completely unfair.

He has a different perspective of the practice of medicine
than you three doctors and the prevailing medical practice,
but I do -- I think it would be wrong to hold that against
him in this case.

Pattern of misconduct, repeated -- (inaudible) -- of the
same misconduct. I don't know what you found whether you
found it based on one or all three and that's -- that's
hard for me to say. I would say that if you found in --
in less than all three cases, then, you know, you found
a pattern. And, again, these are three individual cases
that you ought to consider individually.

Patient A is not Patient B is not Patient C. And so whether
or not he's found to be violating the standard of care
in all three cases or one or whatever should be a factor.

Multiple offenses, again, I don't know how that plays in
here when we've got three separate patients. I don't know
what the Board decided on.
So I would say there are no aggravating factors.
The mitigating factors, again, sort of counterbalance absence of prior disciplinary record, no direct patient harm, absence of dishonest or selfish motive, full cooperation with the Board. I think that's been obviously displayed. There was no visible disability or inherent rehabilitation, again, I think that's in a different type of case.
Remorse, again, I think it would be wrong to hold his validly and sincerely held beliefs against him.
And remoteness of prior discipline, I'm not sure how that comes into play.
I do think the mitigating factors would outweigh any aggravating factors in this case and we mitigate towards a lesser penalty than revocation.
I'm not going to sit here and suggest to the Board any specific penalty. I think that the Board though would be wrong to give the maximum penalty in this case and I think that the mitigating factors do outweigh the aggravating factors and based on your own published guidelines that ought to be taken well into consideration in setting any discipline that you see -- that you give cases.
Do you have anything to add, Mr. Knox?

MR. KNOX: Well, I do not at this time.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

Mr. Jimison, would you like to present any witnesses, exhibits or otherwise be heard on the question of appropriate discipline?

**CLOSING STATEMENT BY MR. JIMISON:**

I do want to be heard. And you may have a copy of the -- of the Medical Practice Act in front of you. Since the Board's Panel has found both issues, one and three, not only are the aggravating and mitigating factors relevant -- and I'm sorry I don't have those in front of me.

If I may ask Ms. Godfrey if I can see her printed list.

MS. GODFREY: Only if you use my checks and balances.

MR. JIMISON: Okay.

MS. GODFREY: Do you want to argue the same ones.

MR. JIMISON: Not really so much those.

But what I really want to draw your attention to in 90-14(a)(12) because you answered that question yes, is that upon the finding of exploitation the Board can order restitution to the individuals. And that's really going to be the -- you know, the bulk of my comments.

I believe that the Board should order restitution to the
three patients, A, B and C or their estates, in the amount that Dr. Buttar charged them. And that his license should be indefinitely suspended until such time that he reapply and that he not be -- that his application not be processed until such time as he has paid restitution to those three patients.

If you indefinitely suspend his license with the restitution, then you don't have to make the finding regarding did his care carry a greater safety risk or was generally ineffective because you're not revoking him. But if you do decide to revoke him, you can do one of two things. If you -- if you -- if you determine that revocation is in order, then I suggest you do one of the following two things.

One, you designate it for which charge.
If you revoke them for (a)(6), then you must make one of the two findings about whether or not it was a greater safety risk or was generally ineffective.
If you revoke them for (a)(12), then you don't have to make those findings. So I would -- I would ask you to -- to, you know, give a sanction for each charge.
And, again, just to clarify because, you know, this is not something we do every day, so I'm sorry to repeat
myself. So if you revoke him for (a)(6), you must make the findings. If you do anything less than revocation (a)(6), you do not have to make the findings. If you -- and also I suggest that you make a separate discipline for (a)(12) and that you order restitution to the victims.

I do believe with Ms. Godfrey's, you know, aggravated -- recitation of the aggravating and mitigating factors. One that I think we could absolutely agree on is there are no -- there are no prior disciplinary actions by Dr. Buttar.

Patient harm, I would submit to that the financial loss is the loss away from their -- from their family to arrange their affairs was a harm that should be considered.

Dishonest or selfish motive, clearly I think Dr. Buttar had a money interest in this case just from the evidence that was presented that, you know, patients were given an arbitrary protocol, one-size fits all, everybody seemed to be paying close to almost $1,000 a day. I think you can reasonably infer from -- from that evidence that that -- there was a dishonest and selfish motive.

I will say this -- about this and it's not like I'm trying to incur your favor with, you know, decide, but I'm not
Dr. Buttar, no one here is Dr. Buttar. We don't know.

Motive and intent is one of the hardest things to prove in any litigation.

However, you can draw reasonable inferences from the conduct. And I think it is a reasonable inference to draw from that conduct that there may have been selfish or -- or a selfish motive.

Vulnerability to victim, I think clearly they were vulnerable. They were desperate people -- you know, they were dealing with -- with a terminal prognosis and -- and one day we probably all will be in that situation. And, you know, and I can't imagine what it must feel like to be in that situation. You all see that in your practices. You all know better than me. So clearly you have much more experience than probably anyone in this room about whether there was vulnerability of the victim.

Refusal to admit wrongful nature of the conduct, clearly that's -- that's here.

Willful or reckless misconduct, again, intent is one of the hardest things to prove, but I think there's reasonable inferences to be drawn.

There isn't really a pattern of misconduct. I think patter of misconduct probably -- well, I'm sorry, I have that
I think there is a pattern of misconduct in the sense that there's multiple patients, he did this over a course of years.

Multiple offenses, I see as a prior disciplinary action. Multiple offenses is that he's been in front of the Board many times in a public setting. I don't think that's established even though there are three patients, I kind of put that more on number 8 and number 9.

There are mitigating factors. I agree with Ms. Godfrey about the absence of a prior disciplinary record. No direct patient harm, again, I think financial loss is a harm and time away from the family. Absence of a dishonest or selfish motive, we talked about that.

Full cooperation with the Board, I will admit that, you know, this has been a case that has been prepared in -- between essentially December and now and it has been difficult at times, but I will not say there has been -- there has been non-cooperation -- I cannot say there's been no cooperation. I would agree to that mitigating factor exists.

Physical or mental disability or impairment, I don't think
Dr. Buttar has a physical or mental disability. Rehabilitation or remedial measures, I wish there was comments on that. I really hope that would it would be remedial or rehabilitation. Remorse, I -- you know, that only can be established by Dr. Buttar. So when you take all that into account, whether or not the aggravating factors outweigh the mitigating factors, I don't know. But what I do know is that the law allows restitution, you found that. And I think in order for there to be clear restitution, there should be an indefinite suspension of his license, that he not be able to reapply until restitution is made to the victims.

I don't have that number in front of me. We can -- we can -- that can just, you know, tailored to -- to the amounts that the Patients A, B and C paid Dr. Buttar's office for their treatments. And that that be conditioned upon his ability to reapply for his license.

MR. KNOX: Can I just add a couple of things.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yes, sir.

CLOSING STATEMENT BY MR. KNOX:

Number one, the restitution, there's not much evidence
that anybody was ever sued or anybody collected from most
of these folks. In particular, Patient C canceled payment
on a check and all payments made up until then were made
by consent of the individual and apparently he was happy
with it.
I don't think Patient D actually sued him and it did not
appear and as a result we filed counterclaim and you said
we did not consider --
PRESIDENT RHYNE: We excluded Patient A.
MR. KNOX: Then if you go to Patient B, there's no one
complaining about that. And Patient C apparently hasn't
paid that bill yet. And so the restitution, it just is
not there.
The second thing is the question about no harm. I think
their expert -- and I want to tell you this and I've tried
in a number of malpractice cases -- (inaudible) and the
examination of the record and you have to understand if
that's what you got, that's what you got and apparently
you've not satisfied with all this being enough.
You have to weigh that when it comes to litigation and
it's not to his credit for what he did. He spent two hours
to go through multiple records and because he's never
studied and didn't know anything about it. And so I think
you have to weigh that when it comes to litigation of how much credibility and how much time did he spend. He did say it was two hours. I don't have the section, he's got it.

And I wonder when it comes to exploitation with regards to the money, if you look at what it costs for that lady to go up to Forsyth Hospital compared to what this doctor is charging you look at the videotapes, what all the people said, he's well in the ballpark of reasonable charges. So I don't think you can just jump off and say, well, his fees were astronomical.

And -- and if you didn't have any efficacy. Oftentimes chemotherapy doesn't have any efficacy and they charge you $187,000 for it. So don't know how you gaged to get the quantitative money on one side or the side that that's exploitation.

If it is, your fees could be jeopardy. Somebody could come and say, well, you know, an anesthesiologist in Wilmington charged X number of dollars and we charge Y, that's the freedom of the market. And so I urge you to consider that in the mitigation.

Anything else?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: All right. Thank you.
The Board will now retire to closed session to consider the evidence and the arguments of counsel and we'll announce the decision.

MR. KNOX: Dr. Buttar wants to know if he can say something.

MR. JIMISON: I don't object to Dr. Buttar making a statement before the Board.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Go ahead, Dr. Buttar.

**COMMENTS BY DR. BUTTAR:**

Dr. Rhyne, I'm not going to -- I'm not going to say much. I'm just going to say that everything that's happened over here today and yesterday, I appreciate you extending the courtesy of coming in early and staying later. I understand that only you guys asked, but I certainly didn't ask for it.

But I can tell you that in 1999 when this fiasco started with me, I really thought that there was a reason for physicians to be physicians to help patients.

If people let government decide what foods they eat and what medicines they take, their bodies will soon be as sorry a state as the souls of those who live under tyranny.

That was said by Thomas Jefferson. And I can tell and
I can assure, I can assure you that I will do everything in my power to protect my patients. I appreciate your time and I appreciate your consideration. But I also know that this witch hunt has been going on for a while and I also know that as in all truth, it will sustain itself. Thank you, ma'am.

MR. KNOX: I'm through.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Okay. We'll go on into closed session.

(WHEREUPON, THE PANEL RECESSED INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 8:34 P.M AND RECONVENED AT 8:45 P.M.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: This Board stands for public protection and not a witch hunt of doctors; and therefore, we think that we should be protecting the people of our state, so we're going to recommend the following to the full Board.

That a summary (sic) suspension to be stayed immediately; And with three restrictions on your license, Dr. Buttar.

One is that you cease the use of hydrogen peroxide. Number two, you do not treat any cancer patients whether
they had cancer in the past, or cancer currently, or they're diagnosed with cancer once you start treatment; and that you do not treat children less than 18 years of age.

This hearing is concluded.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, may I ask a question that may --

MR. KNOX: I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said on the first thing. You said something about --

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Yeah. I said, this Board stands for the public protection and not --

MR. KNOX: I understand that.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: -- and not a witch hunt of doctors.

MR. KNOX: You say they were suspended and for how long.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Stayed immediately.

MS. GODFREY: Stayed immediately.

MR. MANSFIELD: Madame President, I think you said the word summary suspension, did you mean indefinite suspension?

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Indefinite, yes, sir. Indefinite suspension stayed.

MR. KNOX: It was stayed.

MS. GODFREY: No, it was stayed immediately.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: It was stayed immediately.
MS. GODFREY: Stayed. Well --

DR. McCULLOCH: A stayed suspension.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: A stayed suspension.

MR. KNOX: I don't understand.

MR. MANSFIELD: But if I'm right, just for the benefit of the folks here, they asked for clarification on the agreement, Madame President.

Since your panel is making the recommendation, Dr. Buttar's license status will continue to be exactly the same as it was two days ago until such time that the quorum of the Board receives your recommendation and makes a final decision.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Right. This is our Panel decision -- this is the Panel decision that will go to the full Board.

MR. KNOX: Right.

MR. MANSFIELD: Should the -- should the quorum of the Board adopt your recommendation, if they do that, then the effect of the order that will go into place at that time would be that as soon as the order is prepared and executed by the president and served on Dr. Buttar, then that discipline would become effective at that time pending any further appeals you might make.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Correct. All right.
MR. KNOX: Thank you.

PRESIDENT RHYNE: Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, THE HEARING WAS CONCLUDED AT 8:48 P.M.)
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