## RGINIA Vol. 28, No. 25 November 25, 2013 valawyersweekly.com

## VERDICTS & SETTLEMENTS **Necessity of spinal surgery** at issue in med-mal action

## \$1,121,364 Verdict

The plaintiff was a 32-year-old man who suffered a minor L-1 compression fracture as a result of an ATV accident. He was taken to the Loudoun Hospital emergency room where he came under the care of neurosurgeon Dr. Mudit Sharma, who prescribed pain medication and a back brace for the first six weeks following the fracture. The patient had decreasing pain, decreasing pain medication needs and was back to work full time as a construction superintendent when he attended his second post-fracture follow-up visit with Dr. Sharma. Because an intervening CT scan had shown "possibly slightly more compression" of the fracture, Dr. Sharma recommended that the patient undergo a spine surgery called kyphoplasty in order to prevent kyphosis (hunchback) in the future. vasive s ment is through vide sta relief to procedu sion fra osteoly with co healing lished guideli solutely like the trauma patients gical management. During the surgery, the defendant misplaced razor sharp

Type of action: Medical malpractice **Demand: None** Injuries alleged: Permanent nerve damage **Offer: None** causing chronic pain. Name of case: Jacobs v. Mudit Sharma MD & James Melisi MD PLLC **Court: Fairfax County Circuit Court** Case no.:2011-11174 **Tried before: Jury** Judge: Charles J. Maxfield Special damages: \$145,000 in past medical expenses; future medical expenses of \$17,000 annually for pain medication & David Goss, M.D. management

Kyphoplasty is a minimally in-	
spine surgery during which ce-	1
injected into the spinal bones	
hollow needles in order to pro-	
bility to the fracture and pain	2
o the patient. Kyphoplasty is a	
are for patients with compres-	
ctures caused by bone cancers,	
sis or osteoporosis, and people	
nditions that prevent normal	
g of bones. According to pub-	R
professional standards and	
nes, kyphoplasty was "ab-	
v contraindicated" for patients	b
e plaintiff, those patients with	$\mathbf{S}$
tic compression fractures and	h
s clearly improving on non-sur-	tl
anagement. During the surgery,	tı





OSTANT

JONES

instruments and oone drills through the plaintiff's pinal canal bilaterally and injected ot cement, which tracked back hrough the misplaced instrument racts depositing the cement into the patient's spinal canal.

Plaintiff alleged kyphoplasty was an unnecessary surgery for which he was an improper candidate. He also alleged that the surgery had been performed incorrectly. At the time of the surgery, the defendant was seven months out of his neurosurgery residency, had recently taken a one-day training course on the kyphoplasty procedure, and was in the process of gathering the 100 surgical cases he needed in order to complete the oral portion of his neurosurgical board certification. The plaintiff argued that this was a case of a surgeon needing a patient, not a patient needing a surgery. The defendant argued that the plaintiff was a proper candidate, and leakage of cement is just a known complication.

The jury deliberated two and a half hours before returning a verdict for the plaintiff. [13-T-163]

Reprinted with permission of Virginia Lawyers Media, 707 East Main Street, Suite 1750, Richmond, VA 23219. (800) 456-5297 © 2013