



Report to Licensees

of the

LOUISIANA BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Volume 27, No. 1

Winter 2018-2019



Board Changes...

The members of the Louisiana Board of Veterinary Medicine and staff of the Board office would like to welcome two new Board members, Joseph Bondurant, Jr., DVM and Alfred G. Stevens, DVM. Dr. Bondurant practices in the Hammond, Louisiana area (predominantly small animal practice). Dr. Stevens practice in the Baton Rouge, Louisiana area (small animal exclusively). Both have been appointed to serve through July 30, 2023. We extend a warm welcome and best wishes for a productive team.

The Board will miss departing members, John S. Emerson, DVM and Fenton Lipscomb, DVM, whose terms with the Board expired August 1, 2018. The Board appreciates their service and wishes them well with future endeavors.

Newsworthy Items...

Check out the Board's new website at www.lsbvm.org, which now includes online license verification. (You may have to clear your cache for your computer to open the new site.)

Effective 8/1/2018, the Louisiana Board of Veterinary Medicine was moved from the Department of Health to the Department of Agriculture and Forestry.

2019 Board Meeting Dates

The Louisiana Board of Veterinary Medicine will meet at 8:30 a.m. on the following dates:
Thursday, February 7, April 4, June 6, August 1, October 3, and December 5, 2019.



CBD Oil

The Board has received questions on the use of CBD oil, calming agents, and phytocannabinoids in the practice of veterinary medicine. At the outset, it must be noted that the Board's administrative jurisdiction is secondary to any other governmental agency's jurisdiction/laws which are primary on CDS issues and/or criminal activity. The subject matter is an admitted legal quagmire by all interested entities at present.

In short, when a specified drug and/or its extracts as specifically defined are legally permitted (clearly defined as not a crime by the proper Federal and State authorities) to be purchased/possessed/prescribed/dispensed for animals in Louisiana, then the Board would be in the jurisdictional position to determine if such was within the standard of care to be used on animals and for what diagnoses, etc. via its administrative authority. At that time, the consideration of pertinent research regarding the efficacy of the use of a defined product for a certain diagnosed condition would be paramount prior to the exercise of any decision. With that stated, the Board has received the following excerpt from a DEA email, dated August 13, 2018:

DEA recently created a new drug code to classify extracts of marijuana. This new drug code is still a Schedule I controlled substance federally. The question will ultimately stem on whether the substances being sold are classified as marijuana or marijuana extracts under the Controlled Substance Act (CSA). The CSA defines marijuana as: "[all] parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa* L., whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin. Such term does not include the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination." (Underscore added.)

The Board was also recently contacted for a statement regarding a concern with the use of CBD oil by veterinarians as such was represented as being illegal. However, confirmation could not be obtained due to developing authority regarding the possible legality of certain hemp, oil, extracts, etc. The DEA statement above referencing "oil" in the exclusion from the definition still appears to be confusing. It is the Board's understanding from conversing with a DEA Diversion Investigator (enforcement division) that any such oil would have to be tested by the governmental authority with primary jurisdiction to determine the permissible level of THC in a given product. The DEA excerpt quoted above does not reference the permissible THC level for CBD oil believed to be 3% or lower. Please be advised that this reference relates to the Federal authorities, and is not intended to address the Louisiana criminal authorities on the subject matter. There is also the issue of whether the above, if determined to be permissive/allowable, is limited to human use only, and prohibited for use on animals. Therefore, at present, per the Board's administrative jurisdiction, it is reluctant to make any generalized statement/post any notice on this subject matter, until such confusion is resolved by the governmental entities with primary jurisdiction (both Federal and state) and the results confirmed to the Board's satisfaction. The Board will continue its research. Should you need further specific information at present, it is suggested that you contact the proper Federal and state authorities with primary criminal and/or regulatory jurisdiction over the subject matter.

In concluding, please be advised that regardless of what may ultimately be legal to obtain, the use of such product on a patient/animal must be within the standard of acceptable veterinary practice on the diagnosed condition, and not just because the client wants to use the product on his animal. The ultimate question will be if the conduct meets the

**Louisiana Board
of Veterinary Medicine**

301 Main St., Ste. 1050
Baton Rouge, LA 70801
(225) 342-2176
(225) 342-2142 fax
admin@lsbvm.org
www.lsbvm.org

Board Members 2018-19

William H. Green, DVM,
President
James R. Corley, DVM,
Vice-President
Keri Cataldo, DVM,
Secretary-Treasurer
Joseph Bondurant, Jr., DVM,
Member
Alfred G. Stevens, DVM,
Member

acceptable standard of veterinary care provided in a given matter. It is not envisioned that the Board will be in the position to issue an advisory opinion or exclusive listing of what is acceptable (or not), but will deal with each case as it is presented, thus establishing precedent for future reference. While the professional judgment of the practitioner will carry some weight, a fundamental factor in the review will be the qualified medical and research opinions/resources on the efficacy of a certain legal product on a diagnosed condition.

Please monitor the Board's website for any future updates.

Disciplinary Cases

Case No. 17-0215 V- Consent Order was entered wherein the veterinarian failed to meet the acceptable standards of veterinary medicine, more particularly, the patient was not sedated during a difficult time of drawing blood for testing/procedure and was not stable at the time of discharge, as well as a misdiagnosis.



License Renewal Statistics 2018-2019

Active DVM – 1531, Inactive DVM – 129, Faculty DVM – 78,
RVT – 251, CAET – 164, RED – 3
