

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

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON  
FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF OREGON, acting by and through  
the OREGON MEDICAL BOARD,

Plaintiff,

v.

PAUL NORMAN THOMAS,

Defendant.

Case No. 21CV30201

COMPLAINT  
(Judicial Enforcement of Subpoena – ORS  
677.270)

CLAIM NOT SUBJECT TO MANDATORY  
ARBITRATION

Plaintiff not required to pay filing fees in  
advance – exempt per ORS 20.140

Plaintiff State of Oregon, acting by and through the Oregon Medical Board (“OMB”),  
alleges the following facts for its complaint against Defendant Paul Norman Thomas.

**GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

1.

Plaintiff OMB is a state licensing board with authority under ORS chapter 677 to license,  
regulate, and discipline medical doctors, doctors of osteopathic medicine, podiatric physicians,  
physician assistants and acupuncturists in Oregon.

2.

Defendant Thomas obtained a license to practice as a medical doctor in Oregon from  
Plaintiff in 1988. He has practiced pediatric medicine and is the president and owner of non-  
party Integrative Pediatrics Inc., a pediatric medical clinic located in Washington County.

///

1 3.

2 Pursuant to its authority under ORS 677.320, OMB has initiated an investigation into  
3 whether Defendant engaged in unethical conduct or otherwise violated standards of conduct for  
4 licensees in connection with studies on the impact of an alternative vaccination schedule for  
5 measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) and other vaccines on patients seen at his pediatric practice.

6 4.

7 To further its investigation, OMB used its authority under ORS 677.320(2) and (3) to  
8 serve Defendant with an administrative Subpoena Duces Tecum dated August 21, 2020 (the  
9 “Subpoena”). The Subpoena required Defendant to produce specified categories of documents  
10 and information related to his studies by September 21, 2020. A true copy of the Subpoena is  
11 attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated into this Complaint by reference.

12 5.

13 As detailed below, Defendant has resisted the Subpoena and has to date not provided  
14 information that Plaintiff needs for its investigation. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to ORS  
15 677.270 to compel Defendant’s compliance with the Subpoena.

16 ***Information at Issue***

17 6.

18 The Subpoena seeks information related to medical studies involving Defendant’s  
19 patients. The studies purport to present health-related and immunity level outcomes in patients  
20 who previously received care through Defendant at Integrative Pediatrics, including patients who  
21 received MMR vaccines or other vaccines according to alternative schedules differing from  
22 public health authority recommendations.

23 7.

24 One of Defendant’s studies is titled, “Can Integrative Medicine Approaches and a  
25 Selective Vaccine Schedule Impact the Health and Rates of Autism in a General Pediatric  
26 Population?” (“Study 1”). The study describes a population of approximately 161 Integrative

1 Pediatrics patients who received the MMR vaccine after the age of 3, which is later than public  
2 health authority recommendations.

3 8.

4 Defendant also presented results of Study 1 on his patients in a book he co-authored  
5 called *The Vaccine-Friendly Plan: Dr. Paul's Safe and Effective Approach to Immunity and*  
6 *Health-From Pregnancy Through Your Child's Teen Years*. In Appendix E to the book,  
7 Defendant said that he studied autism and autism spectrum disorder rates in 2,230 patients seen  
8 at his clinic. He divided the patients into three groups: 1) 1,098 patients who had received “Dr.  
9 Paul’s Vaccine-Friendly Plan,” which included skipping or delaying recommended vaccines; 2)  
10 238 patients who received no vaccines; and 3) 894 patients who were largely vaccinated  
11 according to Centers for Disease Control guidelines.

12 9.

13 Defendant conducted another study titled, “An Approach to Get MMR Immunity in a  
14 Population of Vaccine Fearful Patients” (“Study 2”). Study 2 purported to examine the MMR  
15 immunity rates of 484 Integrative Pediatrics patients depending on whether they received the  
16 MMR vaccine before or after the age of 3. On information and belief, Study 2 has not been  
17 published.

18 10.

19 The Subpoena requires that Defendant produce specific information related to each study,  
20 including:

21 a) With respect to the Study 1, the Subpoena requires that Defendant provide the  
22 names and dates of birth for the approximately 161 patients subject who received an MMR  
23 vaccine after the age of 3 years old;

24 b) With respect to Study 1, the Subpoena requires Defendant to provide the names  
25 and dates of birth for the 1,098 patients who were vaccinated according to the Dr. Paul’s  
26 Vaccine-Friendly Plan;

1 c) The names and dates of birth for patients in Defendant's studies who were given  
2 only a single dose of the MMR vaccine and had titers drawn to test for the level of antibodies in  
3 their blood, along with the corresponding titer information; and

4 d) With respect to Study 2, a summary report, including a description of the research  
5 methods and the process used for obtaining informed consent, and production of copies of all  
6 forms used to obtain informed consent.

7 The Subpoena gave a deadline of September 21, 2020 for Defendant to produce the information.

8 11.

9 Defendant has failed to comply with the Subpoena. Defendant provided OMB with  
10 spreadsheets identifying MMR vaccine dosage information, titer data, notes, and other  
11 information for patients involved in Study 1. Defendant, however, did not provide the names and  
12 dates of birth for the patients included in the studies, as required by the Subpoena. Plaintiff needs  
13 the patient information for purposes of its investigation into whether Defendant complied with  
14 applicable ethical and professional standards in connection with the studies or in administering  
15 vaccines according to the vaccination schedules described. Defendant did not provide any  
16 documents related to Study 2 or a summary report as required.

17 12.

18 Defendant has resisted providing patient-identifying information for Study 1 on the  
19 merit-less grounds that he is prohibited from disclosing the information by regulations pertaining  
20 to institutional review boards, which are organizations designated under Food and Drug  
21 Administration regulations to oversee clinical trials to protect the rights and welfare of human  
22 subjects. Defendant submitted Study 1 for advance approval by the Western Institutional Review  
23 Board (now part of the WCG IRB) and received a waiver under *former* 45 C.F.R. § 46.101(b)(4)  
24 of certain regulations pertaining to studies under 45 C.F.R. part 46, with the waiver conditioned,  
25 on among things, his not identifying the patients in the studies.

1 13.

2 The waiver of 45 C.F.R. part 46 regulations granted to Defendant under *former* 45 C.F.R.  
3 § 46.101(b)(4) does not prevent Plaintiff from exercising its lawful authority to obtain the  
4 patient-identifying information for purposes of its investigation into Defendant’s conduct. The  
5 regulation does not expressly or impliedly limit the ability of health oversight agencies like OMB  
6 to obtain patient-identifying information for purposes of lawful investigations and regulation of  
7 the practice of medicine.

8 14.

9 Indeed, separate regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and  
10 Accountability Act (HIPAA), expressly authorize Plaintiff to receive the patient-identifying  
11 information demanded in the Subpoena. Under 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(d), a provider such as  
12 Defendant (deemed a “covered entity” under HIPAA) may provide individually identifiable  
13 health information to a health oversight agency for oversight activities authorized by law,  
14 including civil or administrative investigations and licensure and disciplinary proceedings.

15 15.

16 Plaintiff included with its Subpoena a statement of its authority under 45 C.F.R. §  
17 164.512(d) to receive the patient-identifying information for purposes of its investigation.  
18 Plaintiff seeks the information only for its internal purposes related to the investigation and not  
19 to publicly disclose any patient identities. Under ORS 676.165(5), information obtained in the  
20 course of an investigation is exempt from public disclosure. Moreover, Plaintiff’s statement  
21 directs Defendant under 45 C.F.R. § 528(a)(2)(i) to suspend through August 21, 2023 any right  
22 of the patients under HIPAA to receive an accounting of information provided to Plaintiff in  
23 response to the Subpoena, as such disclosures to the subject patients could compromise the  
24 investigation.

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

16.

In addition to resisting providing any patient-specific information for Study 1, Defendant has not provided any documents or information related to Study 2. Defendant has disclaimed any knowledge of Study 2. However, Defendant conducted the study and prepared a written summary, which states that the study was also submitted to the Western Institutional Review Board for a determination that it was exempt from the IRB requirements.

**For its CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Judicial Enforcement of Subpoena – ORS 677.270), Plaintiff alleges:**

17.

Re-alleges paragraphs 1-16.

18.

Plaintiff duly issued and served the Subpoena on Defendant pursuant to its authority under ORS 677.320(2) and (3).

19.

Defendant has failed to provide the documents and information required under the Subpoena.

20.

Pursuant to ORS 677.270, Plaintiff is entitled to one or more remedies from this Court compelling Defendant’s compliance with the Subpoena, including through the imposition of remedies for contempt.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for an order or judgment against Defendant compelling him to comply with the Subpoena by producing all responsive documents and information, imposing remedial sanctions if Defendant does not comply, awarding Plaintiff its costs and disbursements and awarding such further and other relief that the court deems just and equitable.

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

DATED this 27th day of July, 2021.

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
Attorney General

/s/ Daniel J. Rice  
Daniel J. Rice #084536  
Assistant Attorney General  
Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310  
Telephone: (503) 947-4400  
Fax: (503) 373-7067  
Daniel.rice@doj.state.or.us  
Trial Attorney for Plaintiff





1 Witness fee of \$5.00 and mileage fee of eight cents per mile will be tendered with this subpoena if  
2 the above alternative is not accepted as an option.

3  
4 **NOTE:** ORS 183.440 and ORS 677.265(10) provide, in applicable cases, that the Circuit Court of  
5 any County shall compel obedience to subpoenas issued and served, and to punish disobedience or  
6 any refusal to testify, or to answer any lawful inquiry.

7  
8 DATED this August 21, 2020  
9



10 OREGON MEDICAL BOARD

11 By: Nicole Krishnaswami  
12 Nicole Krishnaswami, JD  
13 Executive Director

14  
15 Jason Boemmels  
16 Investigator  
17 971-673-2686  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

