

<b>Subject:</b>	RE: Dinsmore
<b>From:</b>	Jack Garcia ([REDACTED])
<b>To:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Cc:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Date:</b>	Friday, November 18, 2011 8:42 AM

Milton,

I meant 2011. There were no standard of cares issues, meaning Dr. Dinsmore had met or exceeded admitting and care issues in the individual cases reviewed. In essence it meant that from an obstetric nursing point of view all care rendered was appropriate.

My issue was that the CEO called twice seeming to want a review recommendation that would be in keeping with Dr. Goldman's assertions, meaning that the standard of care had not been met. In addition, Dr. Goldman had said to me off site and at work that he was not happy with the "kind" of numbers and patients that Dr. Dins was bringing to Helen Ellis. On one occasion he even went further to specify "Medicaid" and "indigent" types of patients.

Since the coming of the Adventist to Helen Ellis, it is well known that any physician would be held to a standard regarding the "mix" of paying and other insured patients versus Medicaid and other indigent patients. That was disturbing to me given the Adventist avowed "Christian" mission.

I hope this further clarifies any questions.

Sincerely

**From:** mahnee dinsmore [mailto:mahnee\_2000@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 18, 2011 8:28 AM  
**To:** Jack Garcia  
**Subject:** Re: Dinsmore

Hi Jack,

Didn't you mean 2011 and that there were NO standard of care issues? Please reply by a fresh email.

Thanks,

Milton

**From:** Jack Garcia <jgarcia28@humana.com>  
**To:** mahnee dinsmore <mahnee\_2000@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 17, 2011 10:33 AM  
**Subject:** RE: Dinsmore

Milton,

Good morning, my recollection is that the review was around February or March 2010. It was requested by the Williams, Goldman group with an emphasis on c sections and trials of labor for mothers with 2 or more c-sections. In the three cases reviewed, it was found that there were standard of care issues with regard to admission criteria and subsequent care by Dr. D. In addition, there were no adverse outcomes or complaints noted in the chart.

I left for NJ in the latter part of June and returned June 28<sup>th</sup> to be advised that my position had been eliminated and services no longer needed. With reference to Sue Sweet, she and I were in the review process abovementioned along with Margaret Martinez, Erin Possert and Dawn Huthnance.

I hope this clarifies my involvement. If there any questions, please feel free in contacting me.

Sincerely,