

JOEY'S



LEGACY

SEEKING TRUTH AND INTEGRITY IN VETERINARY MEDICINE
VOLUME TWO



AUTHOR JL ROBB

Chapter I

The United States is unique when it comes to Veterinary care:

1. US veterinary care is the most expensive on the planet.
2. Veterinary malpractice in the US is significant and occurs more often than in any other civilized country.

Unfortunately, the veterinary industry of today is hardly ever held accountable because:

*Veterinarians often run the state Veterinary Boards, which offer *oversight*.

*The US court system considers your pet, domestic and non, to be personal property, not part of the family. In other words, your pet is considered similar to a lawnmower, hedge trimmer or shed.

It does not matter if your pet is a service animal/companion. If you are blind and have a dog that assists you, if he dies from veterinary negligence, you just lost your lawnmower.

Medical and veterinary malpractice is not new, but medical malpractice has usually been the most prevalent of the two; because people are people and family pets and support animals are... well, just a lawnmower.

For the owner of pets, from furbabies to the equine community, from cockatoos to hedgehogs, these pets are definitely *family*. They have animal DNA and can replicate themselves, unlike the lawnmower.

Human medical malpractice has large settlements, the only repercussion available, often in the millions of dollars.

Until recently, until groups like Joey's Legacy (JoeysLegacy.org) brought this travesty to the forefront, the deterrent for Veterinarians was laughable, a hundred bucks for your pet or replacement value at the most. The courts, as a rule, do not award the price of your

\$2,500.00 John Deere lawnmower but more of an award for killing your pet, valued in the range of a crockpot.

“I’m sorry I accidentally killed your pet- and I am not acknowledging that I did- how about \$100.00? Will that work?”

No, that will not work, not any longer.

Like the Police Unions protect the police at all costs, even when they know the police in question are bad apples, state Veterinary Boards do the same for their members. And often their members own and operate the Veterinarian Boards. No conflict here! Move on.

Joey’s Legacy.org and the Joey’s Legacy Vet-Mal Facebook page, have worked zealously to change this injustice, while educating the masses of pet owners who do not know this phenomenon occurs.

Soon, a documentary will expose this travesty for the world to see.

How it all began:

The fight back began with an adorable dachshund named Joey. The veterinarian clinic technicians neglected to conduct the necessary blood work and later claimed that Joey’s owner wanted to save money, casting the blame on the victim and doctoring the records.

Most victims of this man-made tragedy understand that doctors sometimes make mistakes. Most veterinarians own up to it, try to console as best they are able and offer assistance, whether monetary or pet-replacement, as though their pet could be *replaced*.

It is not the malpractice or the negligence; it is the coverup by the bad-actor veterinarians and their defenders et al, the state Veterinary Boards.

The Veterinary Boards seemingly never saw a veterinarian they did not love, no matter how many accusations of incompetence or complaints have been filed. They are also a provider of the malpractice insurance the veterinarian buys. No conflict; no foul.

But now, “The gig is up!”

Joey's Legacy and similar groups are rapidly making changes in the current, very-flawed process of veterinary oversight by:

1. Changing the way the courts view a pet.
2. Cleaning of some veterinary board swamps. They are not all swamps, but too many truly are.
3. Upping the penalty for bad-actor vets and enforcing that penalty.
4. Increase monetary awards for the victims.

The reason Veterinary Malpractice Insurance is so inexpensive is because of the meager dollar-penalty awarded. While malpractice insurance for physicians ranges from \$4,000-\$12,000 per year and as much as \$200,000.00 per year for obstetricians, veterinary liability insurance is about \$400.00 per year.

This is changing, however, because of Joey's Legacy and animal rights activists across the land. The idea that our pets are more lawnmower than animal is evolving as courts begin to recognize them as *family or sentient beings*. Sentient references things that are alive, are aware of its surroundings and experience emotions. Anyone who is a pet lover considers the pet to be family.

Joey's Legacy works 24/7 to prevent stories like the one below:

Cape Breton veterinarian who mistakenly euthanized dog loses license, must sell practice

Dr. Sietse VanZwol will no longer have a licence to practise veterinary medicine after 5 p.m. on Friday

MEAT COVE, Nova Scotia (July 8, 2021 update)

By: Sharon Montgomery

A veterinarian who mistakenly euthanized a dog last year has been forced to surrender his licence and sell his animal clinic. Dr. Frank

Richardson, registrar of the Nova Scotia Veterinary Medical Association, said Dr. Sietse VanZwol, owner of Highland Animal Hospital in Port Hawkesbury, will no longer have a licence to practise veterinary medicine after 5 p.m. on Friday, July 9. “He’s no longer allowed to practise anywhere,” Richardson said.

“Not just Nova Scotia but anywhere.” Richardson said. They don’t believe VanZwol intends to try to get a licence elsewhere but if he does he will notify the licencing body of the jurisdiction in question and make them aware of this complaint.

As well, Richardson said according to their legislation, because VanZwol is not a licensed veterinarian anymore, he has one year from July 9 to sell his practice.

Highland Animal Hospital also has offices in Guysborough, Inverness, Chéticamp and Ingonish.

“He has to sell it,” Richardson said. “Because of not being a veterinarian anymore, he cannot stay as an owner. I’m under the understanding the process is already underway.”

Meanwhile, after waiting almost an entire grief-stricken year for the decision, Arlene Fougere of Meat Cove was extremely emotional while relaying she finally got justice for her beloved eight-year-old husky Cooper.

Fougere said her lawyer sent her a copy of the decision and admits it was difficult to open it at first.

“When I got to the final decision I just started bawling,” she said. “I couldn’t even read anymore at one point. I had to keep wiping away my tears to keep reading. I kept saying, ‘omg Cooper won. He’s going to save other animals. Cooper fought for justice for a whole year not just for himself but for other animals and he won, he did it.’”

On Aug. 4, 2020, Fougere took Cooper to a walk-in clinic held in Ingonish by the Highland Animal Hospital in Port Hawkesbury to have the dog’s sore leg checked.

In an earlier story in the *Post*, Fougere said her dog was very healthy and that she had spoken to the veterinary assistant on several occasions regarding her dog's leg.

Due to COVID-19 restrictions at the time, Dr. Sietse Vanzwol came out to the parking lot. Seeing the doctor carrying a rubber band, Fougere assumed he was going to draw blood for testing.

Without carrying a chart or saying a word, the veterinarian gave her dog a needle euthanizing him. Fougere was extremely distraught.

"I screamed, "You killed my dog," she said.

Fougere was so distraught, RCMP responded to the scene to assist.

The veterinarian told her there were three dogs there to be put down and he made a mistake.

Fougere filed a complaint with the provincial veterinarian authority.

Richardson said it did take time for the panel to reach a decision as it was a serious allegation against a member. He said their mandate is what's in the public's best interest. The panel also did an extensive audit of VanZwol's medical records, which added to the time but also helped in making the final decision.

Richardson said even in the weeks leading up to this decision, Dr. VanZwol has only been allowed to practise under certain restrictions including not permitted to do euthanasia and only permitted to work under the direct supervision of two veterinarians.

"Every case he sees has been scrutinized by two veterinarians to see that he is practising in accordance to standards," he said. "That supervision will end Friday at 5 p.m. He's done."

In asking about deficiencies uncovered during the audit and listed in the decision of the panel, Richardson said medical records are an integral part of any medical practice and they take record keeping very seriously.

He said it disappoints him that the member did not have complete medical records as he should have had on his cases.

When asked if during the dealings the NSVMA and complaints panel had with this case if there's been any remorse expressed by VanZwol, Dr. Richardson said he can't answer that as he hasn't had any direct communication with the member since the complaint was lodged last year. However, he said the panel didn't indicate that in their decision.

Richardson agreed it was a heartbreaking situation for the family involved. He feels the complaints committee made the right decision based upon all the factors they had.

"Their intention is to minimize any further harm and risk to the public," he said. "In considering Dr. VanZwol's age and all of the factors playing in, I think to offer him an end date to get out of practice was the right thing and that end date is July 9."

Emotional year

Fougere said it was an emotional year waiting for this decision. Overcome with grief daily, she was unable to concentrate or be motivated to do much of anything, missing her best friend every single day. Fougere said she felt she let Cooper down by taking him to that clinic that day. A lobster fisher, she no longer went out during the year other than when fishing season was on. She has never even been able to bring herself to put her dog's things away. Cooper's treats, stuffed toys and dishes are still where they always were.

"I haven't been on a walk since August," she said, through sobs. "I can't without Cooper. It turned my life upside down. I couldn't function."

However, after the 11 painful months waiting for the decision, Fougere said she understands now why it took the NSVMA so long, she realizes the extent of their audit and is grateful to them for putting that effort into it and for their conclusion.

"I haven't been on a walk since August. I can't without Cooper. It turned my life upside down. I couldn't function." — Arlene Fougere

Throughout the year she has tried to accept the fact she can't change things, she can't go back and redo that day but knows no one else will have to go through the pain she experienced, as the veterinarian responsible can never practise again.

“It's Cooper that did it,” she said, “My dog can finally rest in peace.”

General deficiencies the NSVMA complaint's panel uncovered in regard to Dr. Sietse VanZwol treatment of patients during an audit as part of their investigation into Arlene Fougere's complaint: All records audited demonstrated examples of illegible writing.

- There is often minimal variability in patient vital parameters suggesting the parameters may have not been measured.
- Species identification is frequently lacking.
- No record of justification for diagnoses and treatment plans.
- Minimal diagnostics recommended or performed.
- Surgical procedures performed in a practice without accreditation to do so.
- Diagnoses are often made presumptively without appropriate diagnostics where indicated.
- Numerous examples of inappropriate use of antibiotics.
- Lack of administration of analgesics following surgical procedures, or where patients may have been in pain.
- No review of any current medications that patients are taking.
- No progress or hospitalization notes.
- No follow-up of patients where required.
- No record of dose or duration of medications prescribed.
- No record of client communications.
- Where surgeries are performed, there is no indication of the location where the surgery took place. Additionally, anesthetic drugs used are poorly defined, anesthetic monitoring is not recorded, inhalant anesthesia is often not used or recorded where it would otherwise have been indicated, and post-op pain management is not.

Sharon-Montgomery-Dupeis a health and breaking news reporter at the Cape Breton Post.



Joey's Legacy

Promoting the Animal-Human Bond

Chapter II

Joey's Legacy: The Beginning

Death of Fort Myers family's dachshund leads to state complaint against Alva veterinarian

From News-Press.com, part of USA Today network, July 2, 2018 article by Michael Braun:

Who killed Joey the dachshund?

That question is at the heart of a dispute over the treatment of the 12-year-old animal between the dog's owners and an Alva veterinarian that resulted in a complaint the doctor violated state law.



The complaint filed with the Florida Veterinary Medicine Board on June 4 alleges that Dr. Gene Rinderknecht's treatment of Joey for intestinal bleeding, diarrhea and vomiting ultimately lead to the dog being put to sleep.

The complaint came after a two-month investigation by the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation in late 2017 prompted by Joey's owners, Scott and Debbie Fine of Fort Myers.

The complaint claims Rinderknecht failed to recommend blood work, failed to address the dog's vomiting and had medicine given that was not recommended for dogs with kidney issues without verifying the dog's kidney function.

The complaint also claims that up-to-date written medical records were not kept on the dog.

The complaint asks the seven-member veterinary board, which next meets Sept. 7, to suspend or permanently revoke Rinderknecht's license, restrict his practice, impose a \$5,000 fine on each count or place him on probation.

The last entry on the department's online complaint records listing shows Rinderknecht's complaint is in settlement negotiations.

The doctor, a contract vet at the Daniels Parkway Animal Hospital where he saw Joey, was already on state-imposed probation for an issue when he treated the dog. That probation was the second he has been issued by the state for veterinary work since 2011 and doesn't expire until October.

In the complaint, Scott Fine said Rinderknecht examined and treated Joey in October 2016 and again in June 2017.

The dog recovered after treatment in 2016. The complaint said Rinderknecht failed to note respiration, pulse and outcome of the blood work from this visit.

The complaint said that when Joey was seen by Rinderknecht on June 19, 2017, the doctor prescribed the antibiotic metronidazole but failed to offer blood work and did not note some of the dog's vitals

in medical records. Joey was given a shot of Convenia, an antibiotic normally used to treat common bacterial skin infections in dogs and cats.

Fine found Joey later that day lying on the floor with his ear in the water bowl, the complaint said.



Joey was taken back to the veterinarian's office the next day and seen by Dr. Barry Hendon who performed blood tests. The outcome was that Joey was in kidney failure.

The complaint also said that Convenia, which had been given to Joey on June 19, is not recommended for dogs in kidney failure. However, Hendon disputes that assertion and said Convenia is a good antibiotic that is commonly given to puppies and older dogs.

"I can see how he wants to blame the shot," Hendon said of Fine, adding, "The pet did not die because of a toxic medicine shot."

As for the completeness of Joey's medical records, Hendon agreed that the more complete they are, the better they are. "You try to document as you go," he said.

Joey's condition worsened on June 21, the complaint said, and the Fines agreed to have him put to sleep.

Rinderknecht, who received his veterinary degree from Iowa State University in 1972 and has been a practicing veterinarian for 45 years, declined comment about the complaint.

"When the situation is resolved, I will be able to issue a comment," he said.

However, in a formal written response to the complaint, Rinderknecht disavowed responsibility.

"I am sorry the Fines lost their little friend, Joey, but I do not feel I should shoulder the blame for his demise," Rinderknecht said. "The Fines were told about his severe periodontal disease and did not address the issue. Had they taken the necessary steps in October 2016 his renal disease may have been postponed."

Handwritten medical notes from the practice say that on June 19 the Fines were advised to have dental work done and a growth on the dog's tail removed.

Scott Fine said that never happened and that the doctor's claims that periodontal (tooth and gum) disease caused Joey's demise are wrong because that was addressed prior to the June 19 visit.

"Since he didn't suggest any treatment, we took it upon ourselves to investigate holistic methods of dealing with gum disease, and Joey was taking oral meds to help combat what was a very minor degree (Stage 1 or 2) of gum disease," Fine said. "This took place between the October 2016 and June 2017 visits. We didn't discuss Joey's gums on June 19."

Scott Fine added that claims of money issues raised by the doctor were also false.

"The other thing he told my attorney is that we claimed money was a problem for us. Absolutely not true...we had an agreement with Dr. Hendon to make payments every Thursday for any bills we could not pay all at once," he said.

A notation also says blood work would need to be done and that financial issues were raised. A similar note in the dog's medical files on June 20 said, "owners have financial concerns."

Hendon was sorry for the Fines' loss and agreed he worked with the Fines on financial issues related to Joey. He added that his practice is not adverse to doing blood tests.

"When an owner wants to do blood work," Hendon said, "there's no motivation not to do it."

Fine said he feels that Hendon is a victim in the dispute and that the contract veterinarian did not follow the practice standards.

"It may be the practice's policy to always ask to do blood work," Fine said, "but it's definitely not Rinderknecht's."

Unfortunately, Veterinary Boards always defend the veterinarian involved and seem to provide the liability insurance in many cases.

There are many other stories:

A Long Island family is blaming a Plainview veterinarian at Long Island Veterinary Specialists for the death of their pet, a terrier and family member named Sydney.

The claim:

The clinic utilized improperly trained and unqualified technicians for the MRI procedure.

The veterinary clinic claimed their technicians were well-qualified, properly trained and apparently met all state veterinary requirements. A lawsuit was filed by the family's attorney after learning another dog suffered paralysis and had to be put to death after the same clinic allegedly botched another *non-invasive* procedure.

According to the attorney, "There is a pattern coming out of LIVS, from the facts the clients give me, and I believe in this case there was gross negligence."

According to a *New York Post* article July 31, 2019, a man from Manhattan took his arthritic dog, a 14-year-old rescue dog, Oscar, to

Long Island Veterinary Specialists. Oscar had been limping, so the pet's owner took him to the clinic for treatment and the veterinarian "gave him two risky MRIs that paralyzed Oscar" according to the suit, "after the dog was put under anesthesia for hours and the techs forced his body into positions that damaged his spine."

Court papers in the Oscar suit state that one technician at the facility "has seen this happen before and it is because of how they twist and position the dog for the MTI that causes the problems.

According to the story:

Then the vet - who originally said the MRI would be used to check for a slipped disc or cancer - tried to cover it up by saying the paralysis was temporary and would wear off in a few days and the dog's incontinence was due to the medications he was taking, "when in fact it was from spinal injury," the court documents allege.

A lawyer for LIVS, Alexander Bateman Jr., said, "Nobody at LIVS recommends or renders treatment unless it is medically necessary and fully explained to pet owners."

And another:

Beloved pet's death leads to suit, in trend

New Haven Register

July 28, 2017 update on story from May 4, 2009

By: William Kaempffer

NEW HAVEN -- Seventeen-year-old Brandy Broderick was diagnosed with a mass in her left adrenal gland and, in 2007, underwent surgery to have it removed. After the procedure, fluid was detected in her lungs -- an indication of over-hydration -- and she subsequently died from over-hydration and a pulmonary edema.

Those negligence claims alleged in a malpractice lawsuit filed this year are perhaps no more or less egregious than those made in thousands of wrongful death cases across the country.

One could argue, however, that Brandy's identity does.

She was a dog, a purebred Shetland sheepdog, owned by a Woodbridge man who is suing the animal hospital and surgeon for damages.

Animal law attorneys and legal experts say it's part of a growing trend nationwide of grieving pet owners turning to the legal system for justice because they believe veterinary errors killed their beloved pet. Even so, comparatively, veterinary malpractice suits remain much less common than cases against medical doctors, in large part because of how century-old laws classify animals.

"If you were my wife and you got killed, I could get millions and millions of dollars for pain and suffering, loss of consortium, lost future income," said Bruce Wagman, a California lawyer who specializes in animal law.

That's not allowed in veterinary cases, however. Though society increasingly views pets as irreplaceable family members, animal laws across the country identify them as personal property, not kin, and not much different than furniture or a Buick, which Wagman says is fundamentally unjust.

"People treat their companion animals and feel about them a lot differently than they feel about their sofa," he said.

The Broderick case was filed last month in Superior Court in New Haven by Michael Broderick, Brandy's owner, against the New Haven Central Hospital for Veterinary Medicine and veterinarian Melvyn Pond. The central claim is that Broderick, a licensed veterinarian, issued instructions before the procedure to avoid administering certain induction drugs that would be excreted through the kidneys because Brandy had chronic renal disease and was 17.

The suit claims the procedure was performed in a "hurried or careless manner" such that a surgical sponge was left in the dog's abdominal cavity, that an IV was left in despite detection of fluid in her lungs and the defendants disregarded his presurgical instructions.

Through his attorney, Michael Stone, Broderick declined comment. George Holmes, the attorney for the defendants, did not return phone calls seeking comment. Common law that governs animals generally was written centuries ago, evolving from a more agrarian era to address claims involving farm animals and livestock that were bought and sold with regularity.

While noneconomic damages in human malpractice cases can include awards for pain and suffering and emotional distress, those are rare in veterinary cases. Economic damages generally are limited to the fair market value of the animal, which with a mixed breed might be as low as \$10, and vet costs.

TURNING TO THE COURTS

Courts, however, have started to take animal law more seriously. In Illinois, an appellate court overturned a lower court decision involving veterinary costs for treatment of an injured dachshund. The owner had sued and won a \$5,000 verdict for the dog's treatment but the lower court capped damages at \$200, the prorated replacement cost of the dog. The appellate court concluded she was entitled to the higher amount.

Some juries have concluded family pets have a "unique value" to the owner beyond market value or replacement cost. In California, a jury awarded a dog owner \$39,000 in a veterinary malpractice suit, concluding the mixed breed's special value far exceeded its \$10 market value. The jury awarded \$9,000 for veterinary costs and a special value of \$30,000 for the 3-year-old dog.

But lawyers say that remains the exception. Most successful malpractice suits might net at most \$5,000 or \$10,000, in some cases barely covering litigation costs.

Even so, according to Adam P. Karp, an animal law attorney in Washington state, people will turn to courts because veterinary boards and departments rarely discipline vets except in the most egregious cases.

"Most people bring animal cases out of principle and not out of a desire for money," he said.

Even as animal advocates make headway in the judicial system, legislators in some states have started introducing laws that seem to recognize pets' special value. In Connecticut, a 2004 public act makes a person liable for economic damages to a pet owner if he intentionally and unlawfully kills a cat or a dog. The damages include veterinary care, the animal's fair monetary value and burial expenses, if applicable.

A similar law was passed in Tennessee.

Critics say attempts by advocates to alter the legal status of animals could ultimately result in staggering malpractice awards and skyrocketing veterinary care costs. Estimates of premiums for veterinary malpractice insurance range from \$500 to \$2,500, while medical doctors in some specialties can pay more than \$50,000 a year for malpractice insurance.

"One of our concerns is if these insurance rates are going to rise, what's that going to do to medical care?" said Duane Flemming, a lawyer, animal ophthalmologist and past president of the American Veterinary Medical Law Center. One theory, he said, is that the resulting increased cost of veterinary care will drive down its availability as it becomes less affordable.

At the same time, he noted, veterinarians who promote -- and profit from -- emotional bonds between humans and pets will have a difficult time in court claiming the animal had little value.

An Internet search on Veterinary Malpractice is an eye-opener and a black eye on an industry that once had the fewest members that were bad apples and bad actors, of all industries.

Though things are changing, thanks to Joey's Legacy and a few other groups who tirelessly fight for our pets, the courts still seem to think a dog, cat or horse is no different than a lawnmower, dishwasher or motorcycle.

Chapter III

Beware a scorned Veterinary Board

While bad-actor veterinarians are rare, bad actor Vet Boards (There are 50) seem to be abundant. They appear to be far from fair and balanced; and if you file a complaint, it is unlikely you will win.

This bit of news from the Aligus, established in 2002 to advocate against veterinary malpractice, incompetence, negligence and as a method to educate the public about state veterinary boards' handling of citizen complaints:

<http://www.aligus.com/AboutVetBoards.html>

Each state veterinary board is responsible for licensing veterinarians and regulating the practice of veterinary medicine for the State.

Their mission is to safeguard against unqualified practitioners and to protect the public against veterinary malpractice, incompetence and negligence by carrying out their regulatory duties.

State statutes and rules, generally called the Veterinary Practice Act, stipulate the regulation and enforcement of veterinary medicine.

A performance audit of the Arizona Veterinary Medical Examining Board conducted by The Office of the Auditor General pursuant to a May 29, 1995, resolution of the Joint Legislative Audit Committee detailed deficiencies so serious as to jeopardize the continued existence of the Board. The audit stated that if the Board did not rectify these problems after a five-year time period, the Legislature should consider other alternatives to ensure that the State's regulatory (missing)

*Sources: <http://www.auditorgen.state.az.us/PAD/97-7s.htm>;
http://www.auditorgen.state.az.us/Reports/State_Agencies/Agencies/Veterinary_Examining_State_Board_of/Performance/97-07/97-7.pdf*

THESE DEFICIENCIES RAISE QUESTIONS ABOUT ALL STATE BOARDS.

1. Do Boards discipline when warranted?
2. Do Boards adequately investigate most complaints?
3. Are disciplinary hearings conducted in a timely manner?
4. Is there a need for uniform disciplinary guidelines?
5. Do Boards need to increase public access to information?
6. Do Boards adequately inspect veterinary facilities?
7. Is there adequate public representation?
8. What is the influence of Veterinary Medical Associations?
9. Are disciplinary actions reported to the national database?
10. Do state performance audits need conducted?

From *JoeysLegacy.org*:

LET'S BE CLEAR ABOUT VET BOARDS

For those that have just filed their complaints with their state's vet boards, here are some things you may not already know:

1. Vet boards are set up for success. Not yours, their success and your veterinarian's success, the one that committed the negligence or malpractice. Their mandate is supposed to be to protect your rights as a pet parent as well as the rights of their colleagues in a fair and equitable way. Forget about it. They will, by and large, protect the rights of their colleagues and forget about you.
2. Most vet boards are comprised of 5-8 members. Most of those members are practicing veterinarians, with one or two being consumer advocates who actually shill for the vets, so it's like having all vets on the board, while they feign concern about you and your case. I saw that firsthand during Joey's hearing. As veterinary practitioners, these veterinarians presumably demonstrate care and compassion for their patients during the day. Perhaps they even bond with some of them. As members of a vet board, they become indifferent, insensitive and callous toward pet parents that come before them and request redress for negligence or malpractice.

About 70-80% of complaints are dismissed. The height of disingenuous behavior, hypocrisy and fraud.

3. There is no intelligent reason that a vet board should have a majority of veterinarians. We know from the vet team from Joey's Legacy that, with rare exceptions, if you ask three vets for their opinions on a case, you will get three consenting opinions. By having a majority of veterinarians in a position to decide the case of an accused colleague, you guarantee that the vote (majority rules) will be a firm bias in favor of the colleague. In my opinion, one veterinarian should be included to provide clinical expertise and the other members should consist of a variety of "plain folk" with varying opinions.
4. The complaint you file is likely to take one year or more to resolve, presuming it is not summarily dismissed. Nobody is in a hurry to do anything relating to complaints against veterinarians.
5. The "disciplinary action" imposed by most vet boards, when imposed, reveals the board's reluctance to punish their colleagues firmly and fairly. Small fines, meaningless periods of probation and other lenient measures ensure that "little Johnny" won't learn his lesson and will likely offend again, perhaps on an habitual basis. Ergo, you might say that vet boards contribute to the ongoing permanent injury and death of our companion animals.
6. Finally, while I encourage everyone to file a complaint with their vet board, please do not have any expectations of success or vindication. Those outcomes are few and far between and, until vet boards are dismantled and restructured with a focus on actual justice for pet parents, we must continue to expose and embarrass these corrupt entities as much as possible to forewarn and forearm the still uninformed. We are confident that John Biffar's documentary will do just that.

The Veterinary Boards are not yours or your pet's friend. The vet, good or bad, is the Veterinary Board's friend; and they basically say so in their policies. The Boards do not appear interested in cleaning

up their trash and fight to the hilt to protect the bad actors, who seem to get away with malpractice or negligence, over-and-over again.

And the beat goes on.

When Veterinary Boards are comprised almost solely of veterinarians, it proves difficult to get justice. But they have never met Scott Fine.

Joey's Legacy was founded by Scott Fine and wife, Debbie, after their pet, a dachshund name Joey, was killed, a result of a veterinarian who reportedly cut corners via omission of lab tests and then blamed Joey's owner. Joey's Legacy exists to help others who have become victims, would like to do something about it but then run into the Veterinary Board wall.

Joey's Legacy is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose purpose is advocacy for our companion animals. They have assembled some of the brightest minds in the area of veterinary medicine, grief counseling and animal law that can assist those that come to Joey's with claims of veterinary negligence that cause the permanent injury or death of their loved ones.

Joey's Legacy has numerous educational pod casts and zoom casts and has assembled America's first nationwide network of veterinary experts and animal-law attorneys whose mission is to hold practitioners of veterinary medicine accountable for negligence that results in the permanent injuries and deaths of our pet companions.

Most veterinarians are caring and compassionate individuals, well-suited for the profession. There is a minority, however, of veterinarians that place profits before quality care for their patients and are perfectly willing to doctor-the-documents in order to cover up the story.

Joey's Legacy can help you if you are one of the unfortunate owners of a pet who suffered this tragedy. Pets are people too, created by God on the 6th Day. It is interesting that the sea life and birds were created a day before land animals; and land animals were created the same day as mankind began. He had a reason.

Whether it is legal skills, emotional skills or veterinary skills, Joey's has someone who can provide help. Help can be requested through joeyslegacy.org or through Joey's facebook page: facebook.com/groups/Joey'sLegacy

END OF BOOK SAMPLE