

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF**
2 **PODIATRY EXAMINERS**

3 IN THE MATTER OF:

4 **CHRISTOPHER SUYKERBUYK, DPM,**

5 **Holder of License No. POD-000728**

6 For the Practice of Podiatry

7 In the State of Arizona.

Case No.: 24-01-C

**ORDER FOR CONTINUING
EDUCATION**

(NON-DISCIPLINARY)

8 At its meeting on May 8, 2024, the Arizona State Board of Podiatry Examiners (Board)
9 voted to issue Christopher Suykerbuyk, DPM, (Respondent), a non-disciplinary Continuing
10 Education (CE) Order (Order) to address issues raised in the complaint and the Board's
11 subsequent investigation. The Board, pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-852.01(C)(3), determined that
12 while the conduct was not of sufficient seriousness to merit direct action, Respondent would, as
13 set forth below, benefit from completing a prescribed number of hours of CE in a specific practice
14 area or areas for purposes of providing him with the necessary understanding of current
15 developments, skills, procedures or treatment.

16 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

17 1. The Arizona State Board of Podiatry Examiners is the duly constituted agency for
18 licensing and regulating of the practice of podiatry in the State of Arizona and has jurisdiction over
19 Respondent as a licensee of the Board and the subject matter pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-801, *et seq.*

20 2. Respondent is the holder of License Number POD-000728, which enables him to
21 practice podiatry in the State of Arizona.

22 3. The Board opened a case and conducted an investigation after receiving a complaint
23 from K.K. on January 12, 2024, alleging Respondent committed multiple actionable violations of
24 Board statute and rule. Specifically, K.K. alleged Respondent performed inadequate bunionectomy
25 and hammertoe correction surgery on her right foot and unnecessarily delayed her treatment.

26 4. Records indicate that K.K. first presented to Respondent on May 3, 2021, with a
chief complaint in bunion and second hammertoe pain. Respondent performed an examination and

1 took radiographs. Respondent presented his findings to K.K. including her surgical options.
2 Respondent recommended a Lapiplasty bunionectomy.

3 5. On January 13, 2022, K.K. presented to Respondent for surgery. Respondent
4 performed a Lapidus bunionectomy and second digit hammertoe repair.

5 6. On March 22, 2022, K.K. presented with a chief complaint of pain in the area where
6 Respondent had placed the fixation hardware.

7 7. On March 31, 2022, Respondent performed surgery to remove the fixation
8 hardware.

9 8. Between April 15, 2022, and May 11, 2022, Respondents treatment records for
10 K.K. indicate that her pain and swelling continued to increase. A CT scan on April 26, 2022,
11 showed “solid fusion of the dorsal and central 1st MTP, 1.3cm well-corticated bony fragment
12 inferior to the 2nd metatarsal base suggestive of chronic fracture.”

13 9. At the Board’s May 8, 2024, meeting the Respondent was present telephonically.
14 The Board discussed the allegations with the Respondent and found no violation of Board statute
15 or rule. They did, however, determine that the Respondent’s communication with the patient was
16 lacking and that the standard for post-operative care may not have been met.

17 10. Respondent communicated to Complainant to transition into athletic shoes 36 days
18 post-operatively. The Board discussed that the patient may have benefited from a longer non-
19 weight bearing time-frame and that Respondent should have extended the non-weight bearing time
20 frame given Respondent’s age and the post-operative condition of her foot.

21 11. The Board noted that Complainant was persistent in telling Respondent that her
22 foot was still painful. The Board found that Respondent should have actively listened to
23 Complainant.

24 12. Based on the investigative record and the discussion with the Respondent, including
25 the issues noted above, the Board found that the Respondent would benefit from Continuing
26 Education in the areas listed below in the Order.

1 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

2 1. The Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter and over Respondent
3 pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-801 *et seq.*

4 2. The Board has the authority to issue a non-disciplinary Order for Continuing
5 Education pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-852.01(C)(3), if it believes the Respondent would benefit from
6 completing a prescribed number of hours of CE in a specific practice area for purposes of
7 providing him with the necessary understanding of current developments, skills, procedures or
8 treatment.

9 **ORDER**

10 1. **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that within **six months** from the effective date of this
11 Order, Respondent shall complete a minimum of **six** total hours of Board pre-approved CE in the
12 following areas: **three** hours in patient communication, and **three** hours in postoperative care. The
13 CE hours shall be in addition to the hours required for the annual renewal of his podiatry license.

14 2. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Respondent shall, within **six months** of the
15 effective date of this Order, provide Board staff with proof of attendance in satisfaction of this
16 requirement.

17 3. Respondent shall within **60 days** of the effective date of this order submit his
18 request for CE to the Board for pre-approval. The request for pre-approval must include the
19 following: course name, instructor, date, delivery method, number of continuing education hours,
20 course description, syllabus, outline, table of contents, etc., and the name of the recognized
21 continuing education provider.

22 4. Respondent's failure to timely comply with the Order will subject him to future
23 disciplinary action by the Board. A.R.S. § 32-854.01(23).

24 5. The effective date of the Order is the date it is signed by the Board's Executive
25 Director on behalf of the Board President.

RIGHT TO APPEAL

1 A licensee has the right to PETITION FOR REVIEW of the Order pursuant to A.C.C. R-4-25-
2 401. According to A.A.C. R-4-25-401(A), the PETITION must be filed with the Board within
3 thirty (30) days after personal service of this Order or within thirty-five (35) days from the date of
4 the mailing if the Order was served by Certified Mail. Pursuant to A.A.C. R4-25-401(C), the
5 PETITION must set forth legally sufficient reasons for granting the review. The filing of a
6 PETITION FOR REVIEW is required to preserve any rights of appeal to the Superior Court
7 pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(B) and A.R.S. § 12-904.
8

9 THIS ORDER SHALL BE EFFECTIVE WHEN SIGNED BY THE BOARD OR ITS
10 DESIGNEE ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD. However, the timely filing of a motion for review
11 shall stay the enforcement of the Board's Order unless, pursuant to A.A.C. R4-25-401(G), the
12 Board has expressly found good cause to believe that the Order shall be effective immediately
13 upon issuance and has so stated in this Order.
14

15
16
17 DATED THIS 19TH DAY OF JUNE, 2024

18 ARIZONA BOARD OF PODIATRY EXAMINERS

19
20 By: Barbara A. Campbell, D.P.M.
21 Barbara A. Campbell, D.P.M., Board President

22 Original of the foregoing was e-filed
23 this 19th day of June, 2024, with the:

24 Arizona State Board of Podiatry Examiners
25 1740 West Adams Street, Suite 3004
26 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Copies of the foregoing sent by Electronic,
mail this 19th day of June, 2024, to:

Dr. Christopher Suykerbuyk, DPM

1 Email of Record

Respondent

2 Copy of the foregoing sent via Electronic mail
3 this 19th day of June, 2024, to:

4 Seamus Monaghan

Assistant Attorney General

5 2005 N. Central Avenue, SGD/LES

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

6 *Attorney for the Board*

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26