May 9, 2002

CERTIFIED MAIL-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Zbigniew Paul Lorenc, M.D.
983 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10028

RE: License No. 157786

Dear Dr. Lorenc:

Enclosed please find Order #BPMC 02-136 of the New York State Board for Professional Medical Conduct. This Order and any penalty provided therein goes into effect May 9, 2002.

If the penalty imposed by the Order is a surrender, revocation or suspension of this license, you are required to deliver to the Board the license and registration within five (5) days of receipt of the Order to Board for Professional Medical Conduct, New York State Department of Health, Hedley Park Place, Suite 303, 433 River Street, Troy, New York 12180.

Sincerely,

Ansel R. Marks, M.D., J.D.
Executive Secretary
Board for Professional Medical Conduct

Enclosure

cc: Robert S. Portegello, Esq.
DiJoseph and Portegello, P.C.
108 Main Street
Staten Island, NY 10307
IN THE MATTER OF

ZBIGNIEWS PAUL LORENC, M.D.

ORDERED, that the Consent Agreement, and its terms, are adopted and
SO ORDERED, and it is further

ORDERED, that this Order shall be effective upon issuance by the Board, either
• by mailing of a copy of this Consent Order, either by first class mail to Respondent
  at the address in the attached Consent Agreement or by certified mail to
  Respondent's attorney, OR
• upon facsimile transmission to Respondent or Respondent's attorney,
  Whichever is first.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 8, 2002

WILLIAM P. DILLON, M.D.
Chair
State Board for Professional Medical Conduct
ZBIGNIEW PAUL LORENC, M.D., representing that all of the following statements are true, deposes and says:

That on or about April 2, 1984, I was licensed to practice as a physician in the State of New York, and issued License No. 157786 by the New York State Education Department.

My current address is 983 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10028, and I will advise the Director of the Office of Professional Medical Conduct of any change of address.

I understand that the New York State Board for Professional Medical Conduct has charged me with five specifications of professional misconduct.

A copy of the Statement of Charges, marked as Exhibit "A", is attached to and part of this Consent Agreement.

I agree not to contest the Second Specification solely insofar as it pertains to the allegations in Paragraphs B and B3, in full satisfaction of the charges against me, and agree to the following penalty:

I shall be issued a censure and reprimand, pertaining to the Second Specification solely insofar as it pertains to the allegations in Paragraphs B and B3;

I shall be subject to a condition, imposed pursuant to Section 230 of the Public Health Law, requiring that I submit a letter to the editor of
the Journal for Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery in the form marked as Exhibit "B" attached to and made a part of this Consent Agreement and Order.

I further agree that the Consent Order shall impose the following conditions:

That Respondent shall maintain current registration of licensure with the New York State Education Department Division of Professional Licensing Services (except during periods of actual suspension), and shall pay all registration fees. This condition shall take effect thirty (30) days after the Consent Order's effective date and will continue so long as Respondent remains licensed in New York State; and

That Respondent shall cooperate fully with the Office of Professional Medical Conduct (OPMC) in its administration and enforcement of this Order and in its investigations of matters concerning Respondent. Respondent shall respond in a timely manner to all OPMC requests for written periodic verification of Respondent's compliance with this Order. Respondent shall meet with a person designated by the Director of OPMC, as directed. Respondent shall respond promptly and provide all documents and information within Respondent's control, as directed. This condition shall take effect upon the Board's issuance of the Consent Order and will continue so long as Respondent remains licensed in New York State.
I stipulate that my failure to comply with any conditions of this Order shall constitute misconduct as defined by New York State Education Law §6530(29).

I agree that if I am charged with professional misconduct in future, this Consent Agreement and Order shall be admitted into evidence in that proceeding.

I ask the Board to adopt this Consent Agreement.

I understand that if the Board does not adopt this Consent Agreement, none of its terms shall bind me or constitute an admission of any of the acts of alleged misconduct; this Consent Agreement shall not be used against me in any way and shall be kept in strict confidence; and the Board's denial shall be without prejudice to the pending disciplinary proceeding and the Board's final determination pursuant to the Public Health Law.

I agree that, if the Board adopts this Consent Agreement, the Chair of the Board shall issue a Consent Order in accordance with its terms. I agree that this Order shall take effect upon its issuance by the Board, either by mailing of a copy of the Consent Order by first class mail to me at the address in this Consent Agreement, or to my attorney by certified mail, OR upon facsimile transmission to me or my attorney, whichever is first.

I ask the Board to adopt this Consent Agreement of my own free will and not under duress, compulsion or restraint. In consideration of the value to me of the Board's adoption of this Consent Agreement, allowing me to resolve this matter without the various risks and burdens of a hearing on the merits, I knowingly waive my right to contest the Consent Order for which I apply, whether administratively or judicially, I agree to be bound by the Consent Order, and ask that the Board adopt this Consent Agreement.

DATED 4/18/02

ZBIGNIEW PAUL LORENC, M.D.
RESPONDENT
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The undersigned agree to Respondent's attached Consent Agreement and to its proposed penalty, terms and conditions.

DATE: 1/18/02  ROBERT S. PORTEGELLO, ESQ.
        Attorney for Respondent

DATE: 4/19/02  PAUL STEIN, ESQ.
        Associate Counsel
        Bureau of Professional Medical Conduct

DATE: 5/21/02  DENNIS J. GRAZIANO
        Director
        Office of Professional Medical Conduct
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
STATE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL MEDICAL CONDUCT

IN THE MATTER
OF
EDWARD JOSEPH IVY, M.D.
ZBIGNIEW PAUL LORENC, M.D.

EDWARD JOSEPH IVY, M.D., the Respondent, was authorized to practice medicine in New York State from on or about July 1, 1992 through on or about July 1, 1993, by the issuance of limited permit number LP#69684 by the New York State Education Department.

ZBIGNIEW PAUL LORENC, M.D., the Respondent, was authorized to practice medicine in New York State on or about April 2, 1984, by the issuance of license number 157786 by the New York State Education Department.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Between approximately November 1992 and July 1993 Respondents Ivy and/or Lorenc performed facelifts on 21 patients (all patients are identified in Appendix A, attached below) at Manhattan Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat Hospital (MEETH) in New York, New York as part of an alleged research study.

1. Respondents, without medical indication, did not employ the same facelift technique on the right and left side of each patient’s face.

Exhibit A
2. Respondents failed to obtain informed consent from each patient to use different facelift techniques on the right and left side of each patient's face and to include him or her in a research study.

3. Respondents failed to keep an adequate record for each patient.

B. In the December 1996 issue of the Journal for Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Respondents Ivy and Lorenc, with co-author Sherrill Jerome Aston, M.D., published an article entitled, "Is there a Difference? A Prospective Study Comparing Lateral and Standard SMAS Facelifts with Extended SMAS and Composite Rhytidectomies." In this article, they reported the surgery allegedly performed and reported the results of the surgical research allegedly performed on 21 patients at MEETH (referred to in Paragraph A, above).

1. Respondents, knowingly, with intent to deceive, inaccurately reported the surgery performed on some or all of the 21 patients.

2. Respondents, knowingly, with intent to deceive, inaccurately reported the research study (including its results) allegedly performed on some or all of the 21 patients.

3. Respondents inaccurately reported the surgery and the research study (including its results) allegedly performed on some or all of the 21 patients.
SPECIFICATION OF CHARGES

FIRST SPECIFICATION

GROSS NEGLIGENCE

Respondents are charged with committing professional misconduct as defined in N.Y. Educ. Law §6530(4) by practicing the profession of medicine with gross negligence on a particular occasion as alleged in the facts of the following:

1. Paragraphs B and B3.

SECOND SPECIFICATION

NEGLIGENCE ON MORE THAN ONE OCCASION

Respondents are charged with committing professional misconduct as defined in N.Y. Educ. Law §6530(3) by practicing the profession of medicine with negligence on more than one occasion as alleged in the facts of two or more of the following:

2. Paragraphs A, A1, B, and B3.

THIRD SPECIFICATION

FRAUDULENT PRACTICE

Respondents are charged with committing professional misconduct as defined by N.Y. Educ. Law §6530(2) by practicing the profession of medicine fraudulently as alleged in the facts of the following:

3. Paragraphs B, B1, and B2

FOURTH SPECIFICATION

PERFORMING UNAUTHORIZED SERVICES

Respondents are charged with committing professional misconduct as defined in N.Y. Educ. Law §6530(26) by performing professional services which
Respondents are charged with committing professional misconduct as defined in N.Y. Educ. Law §6530(32) by failing to maintain a record for each patient which accurately reflects the care and treatment of the patient, as alleged in the facts of:

5. Paragraphs A and A3.

DATED: February 25, 2002
New York, New York

Roy Nemerson
Deputy Counsel
Bureau of Professional Medical Conduct
operative follow up was limited to the review of photographs taken of the patients at Manhattan Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat. As reported in the article, the photographs were allegedly taken of the patients at 6 months and 12 months after the surgery. It has been brought to my attention that perhaps one of the study’s participants, referred to in the article, may not have fully completed the one (1) year post-operative follow-up regimen therein indicated to have applied to all of the study’s participants.

LETTER TO BE SENT BY RESPONDENT, Z. PAUL LORENC.M.D., TO EDITOR OF JOURNAL FOR PLASTIC AND RECONSTRUCTIVE SURGERY

Z. PAUL LORENC, M.D.
983 Park Avenue
New York, New York

Editor
Journal For Plastic and
Reconstructive Surgery

Re: December, 1996 Issue
of Journal For Plastic
Article Titled Is There A
Difference? A Prospective Study
Comparing Lateral and Standard
SMAS Face Lifts With Extended
SMAS And Composite
Rhytidectomies

Dear Editor:

It has recently come to my attention that the use of the word “randomized” in the “Patients and Methods” section of the above article may not be clear and may be confusing. I wish to clarify that the term “prospective randomized” was being used in the sense that none of the study’s participants were pre-selected or operated on in any manner to influence any predetermined or profound surgical outcome. To the best of my knowledge the patients were not chosen on the basis of some randomized factor such as patient identification number or social security number.

Except in regard to my one private patient, my participation in the post-operative follow up was limited to the review of photographs taken of the patients at Manhattan Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat. As reported in the article, the photographs were allegedly taken of the patients at 6 months and 12 months after the surgery. It has been brought to my attention that perhaps one of the study’s participants, referred to in the article, may not have fully completed the one (1) year post-operative follow-up regimen therein indicated to have applied to all of the study’s participants.

EXHIBIT “B”
This letter is my attempt to clarify any confusion in the article and that if I had been aware of these issues at the time of the article's original submission in 1996 the article would not have been submitted to you in its original form and the text would reflect same.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the conclusions reached in the article would still apply.

Very truly yours,

Z. PAUL LORENC