

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

**Middlesex, ss.**

**Division of Administrative Law Appeals**

**Board of Registration in Medicine,**  
Petitioner,

No. RM-20-258

Dated: January 19, 2023

v.

**Keshaudas Pahuja, M.D.,**  
Respondent.

**Appearance for Petitioner:**

James Paikos, Esq.  
178 Albion Street  
Wakefield, MA 01880

**Appearance for Respondent:**

Keshaudas Pahuja, M.D. (pro se)  
18 Meadow Lane  
Milton, MA 02186

**Administrative Magistrate:**

Yakov Malkiel

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED DECISION**

Discipline may be imposed upon the respondent physician in connection with his deficient care to multiple patients; his malpractice with respect to one patient, and his failure to maintain adequate medical records with respect to another patient's surgery.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION**

**Procedural Posture**

The Board of Registration in Medicine commenced disciplinary proceedings against respondent Keshaudas Pahuja, M.D., seeking both a summary suspension and non-summary discipline. The board's allegations arose from surgeries that Dr. Pahuja performed on six individuals, identified as Patients A-F.

In September 2021, Chief Administrative Magistrate McGrath issued a recommended decision (*Pahuja I*), making 51 numbered findings of fact and authorizing a summary suspension. The board later adopted the recommended decision (*Pahuja II*).

Citing Chief Magistrate McGrath's findings, complaint counsel moved for partial summary decision. An order dated December 21, 2022 (*Pahuja III*) allowed the motion in part and denied it in part, entering summary decision for the board in connection with specific bases for discipline recapped *infra*. Thereafter, complaint counsel withdrew the board's outstanding allegations and moved for a recommended decision.

### **Findings of Fact**

I adopt and incorporate by reference the findings of fact stated in *Pahuja I*, as adopted by the board in *Pahuja II* and discussed further in *Pahuja III*.

### **Rulings of Law**

I reaffirm and incorporate by reference the analysis described in *Pahuja III*. On the basis of that analysis, I rule as follows:

1. Dr. Pahuja's treatment of Patients A, E, and F places into question his competence to practice medicine. *See* G.L. c. 112, § 5, eighth para., (c); 243 C.M.R. § 1.03(5)(a)(3).
2. Dr. Pahuja's treatment of Patient F was malpractice. *See* 243 C.M.R. § 1.03(5)(a)(17).
3. Dr. Pahuja violated a regulation of the board by preparing an illegible, inadequate operative note of Patient D's surgery. *See* 243 C.M.R. §§ 1.03(5)(a)(11), 2.07(13)(a).

### **Conclusion**

The board may impose disciplinary measures on Dr. Pahuja in connection with the bases of discipline described *supra*.

Division of Administrative Law Appeals

/s/ Yakov Malkiel

Yakov Malkiel

Administrative Magistrate