

**FILED**

February 19, 2002

**NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD  
OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS**

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
DEPARTMENT OF LAW & PUBLIC SAFETY  
DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

---

|                                  |   |                       |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| IN THE MATTER OF THE SUSPENSION  | : |                       |
| OR REVOCATION OF THE LICENSE OF  | : | Administrative Action |
|                                  | : |                       |
| PERCY NARANJO, M.D.              | : | FINAL ORDER           |
| License No. MA 035780            | : | OF DISCIPLINE         |
|                                  | : |                       |
| TO PRACTICE MEDICINE AND SURGERY | : |                       |
| IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY       | : |                       |

---

This matter was opened to the New Jersey State Board of Medical Examiners upon receipt of information which the Board has reviewed and on which the following findings of fact and conclusions of law are made.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Respondent Percy Naranjo, M.D., is a physician in the State of New Jersey and has been a licensee at all times relevant hereto.

2. Respondent's license to practice medicine in California was revoked on October 26, 1998. The revocation was stayed to become a two-year period of probation with terms and conditions, and respondent was ordered to enroll in The Physician Assessment and Clinical Education (PACE) Program at the University of

**CERTIFIED TRUE COPY**

California, San Diego School of Medicine to undergo assessment, clinical training and examination. Following said assessment, training and successful examination, respondent was to submit a plan of practice in which his practice would be monitored by another physician in respondent's field of practice, who was to provide periodic reports to the Division of Medical Quality of the Medical Board. Respondent was also ordered to submit quarterly declarations stating whether there had been compliance with the conditions of probation, and to appear in person for interviews at various intervals. (Copy of stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order attached hereto and made part hereof)

3. Respondent admitted each and every allegation of an accusation which had been filed against him charging gross negligence, repeated negligent acts, incompetence, prescribing without medical indication, and excessive prescribing. The charges were based on his prescribing of Nardil as a first line antidepressant to a patient on many occasions over a period of three years (October 1990 to October 1993) without any history pertaining to the patient's refractoriness to other antidepressant medications. He also failed to prescribe Nardil in a therapeutic dosage both initially and throughout the period of treatment, and without advising the patient of the need for a special diet and avoidance of certain over-the-counter drugs while taking Nardol. He prescribed Pamelor for the same patient during the same three-

year period (November 1990 to October 1993) as a first line antidepressant without any history of refractoriness to other antidepressant medications, including Nardil; failed to advise the patient and/or note in the medical records a warning regarding the potential life-threatening interaction between Pamelor and Nardil; failed to discontinue Nardil for 10 to 14 days before beginning the patient on Pamelor; and failed to prescribe Pamelor in therapeutic dosages. One year after beginning the patient on Nardil and Pamelor, and for about two years thereafter (October 1991 to October 1993), respondent prescribed three antidepressants (Nardil, Pamelor and Desipramine) to the patient at the same time, failing to discontinue Nardil before beginning Desipramine, and failing to advise the patient and/or note in the medical records a warning regarding the potential life-threatening interaction of Nardil with Desipramine and Pamelor. For just under three years (January 1991 to October 1993) respondent prescribed Dexamethasone to the patient in the absence of indications for its use. For just over a year (June 1992 to October 1993) respondent prescribed Inderal, which is contraindicated for use with Nardil, for the same patient. From October 1990 to October 1993, respondent failed to order laboratory tests for liver, thyroid and bone marrow function; failed to note the patient's weight in the medical chart; failed to consider alternative therapies in light of the patient's failure to obtain relief for the same symptoms over the course of three years under

respondent's care; and failed to assess whether the headaches and high blood pressure of which the patient complained throughout the three years of treatment was the result of the Nardil therapy, inasmuch as headaches and high blood pressure are common side effects of treatment with Nardil.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Respondent's admission to each and every allegation of the accusation filed against him charging gross negligence, repeated negligent acts, incompetence, prescribing without medical indication, and excessive prescribing, and the revocation of his license to practice in California, provide grounds for the suspension or revocation of respondent's license to practice medicine in New Jersey pursuant to N.J.S.A 45:1-21(c), (d), (e) and (g).

#### DISCUSSION ON FINALIZATION

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, a Provisional Order of Discipline revoking respondent's license to practice medicine and surgery in the State of New Jersey was entered on March 20, 2000. The Provisional Order was subject to finalization by the Board at 5:00 p.m. on the 30th business day following entry unless respondent requested a modification or dismissal of the stated Findings of Fact or Conclusions of Law by submitting a written request for modification or dismissal setting forth in writing any and all reasons why said findings and conclusions

should be modified or dismissed and submitting any and all documents or other written evidence supporting respondent's request for consideration and reasons therefor.

Respondent submitted a letter dated July 16, 2001 in which he and argued that his probation in California had ended, and therefore, his New Jersey license should not be revoked. Respondent did not contest the entry of the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. He also attached a copy of a second Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order in connection with charges of violation of the provisions in the original Order. Though respondent's California probation had ended, the Board was unpersuaded by respondent's argument that his New Jersey license should not be revoked. Because respondent admitted in the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, every allegation of an accusation which had been filed against him charging gross negligence, repeated negligent acts, incompetence, prescribing without medical indication, and excessive prescribing, discipline in this matter was appropriate.

Respondent's submissions were reviewed by the Board, and the Board determined that further proceedings were not necessary and that no material discrepancies had been raised. The Board was not persuaded that the submitted materials merited further consideration, as respondent did not dispute the Findings of Fact or Conclusions of Law.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS on this 19th day of February, 2002  
ORDERED that Respondent's license to practice medicine and surgery  
in the State of New Jersey is hereby revoked.

NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD OF  
MEDICAL EXAMINERS

*William V. Harrer M.D.*

By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
William V. Harrer, M.D., B.L.D.  
Board President