

1 ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2 JUDITH T. ALVARADO
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 State Bar No. 155307
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
4 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6453
5 Facsimile: (916) 731-2117
Attorneys for Complainant
6

7
8 **BEFORE THE**
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
9 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 600-2021-000650

12 **JAMES HUSEN, PSY.D.**
13 **150 Digby Court**
Riverside, CA 92506-6123

ACCUSATION

14 **Psychologist License No. PSY 30102,**

15 Respondent.
16

17 **PARTIES**

18 1. Antonette Sorrick (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity
19 as the Executive Officer of the Board of Psychology, Department of Consumer Affairs.

20 2. On or about May 21, 2018, the Board of Psychology issued Psychologist License
21 Number PSY 30102 to James Husen, Psy.D. (Respondent). The Psychologist License was in full
22 force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on May 21,
23 2026, unless renewed.

24 **JURISDICTION**

25 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Psychology (Board), under the
26 authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code
27 (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

28 ///

1 4. Section 2920.1 of the Code states:

2 Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the Board of
3 Psychology in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions.
4 Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be
5 promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount.

6 **STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

7 5. Section 2960 of the Code states:

8 The board may refuse to issue any registration or license, or may issue a
9 registration or license with terms and conditions, or may suspend or revoke the
10 registration or license of any registrant or licensee if the applicant, registrant, or
11 licensee has been guilty of unprofessional conduct. Unprofessional conduct shall
12 include, but not be limited to:

13 (a) Conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions
14 or duties of a psychologist or registered psychological associate.

15 (b) Use of any controlled substance as defined in Division 10 (commencing
16 with Section 11000) of the Health and Safety Code, or dangerous drug, or any
17 alcoholic beverage to an extent or in a manner dangerous to themselves, any other
18 person, or the public, or to an extent that this use impairs his or her ability to perform
19 the work of a psychologist with safety to the public.

20 (c) Fraudulently or neglectfully misrepresenting the type or status of license or
21 registration actually held.

22 (d) Impersonating another person holding a psychology license or allowing
23 another person to use his or her license or registration.

24 (e) Using fraud or deception in applying for a license or registration or in
25 passing the examination provided for in this chapter.

26 (f) Paying, or offering to pay, accepting, or soliciting any consideration,
27 compensation, or remuneration, whether monetary or otherwise, for the referral of
28 clients.

(g) Violating Section 17500.

(h) Willful, unauthorized communication of information received in
professional confidence.

(i) Violating any rule of professional conduct promulgated by the board and set
forth in regulations duly adopted under this chapter.

(j) Being grossly negligent in the practice of their profession.

(k) Violating any of the provisions of this chapter or regulations duly adopted
thereunder.

(l) The aiding or abetting of any person to engage in the unlawful practice of
psychology.

1 (m) The suspension, revocation or imposition of probationary conditions by
2 another state or country of a license or certificate to practice psychology or as a
3 psychological assistant issued by that state or country to a person also holding a
4 license or registration issued under this chapter if the act for which the disciplinary
5 action was taken constitutes a violation of this section.

6 (n) The commission of any dishonest, corrupt, or fraudulent act.

7 (o) Any act of sexual abuse, or sexual relations with a patient or former patient
8 within two years following termination of therapy, or sexual misconduct that is
9 substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a psychologist or
10 registered psychological associate.

11 (p) Functioning outside of his or her particular field or fields of competence as
12 established by his or her education, training, and experience.

13 (q) Willful failure to submit, on behalf of an applicant for licensure,
14 verification of supervised experience to the board.

15 (r) Repeated acts of negligence.

16 6. Section 2936 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

17 The board shall adopt a program of consumer and professional education in
18 matters relevant to the ethical practice of psychology. The board shall establish as its
19 standards of ethical conduct relating to the practice of psychology, the “Ethical
20 Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct” (Ethical Principles) published by
21 the American Psychological Association (APA). Those standards shall be applied by
22 the board as the accepted standard of care in all licensing examination development
23 and in all board enforcement policies and disciplinary case evaluations.

24 **APA ETHICAL PRINCIPLES**

25 7. APA Ethical Principles, Standard 3.05, “Multiple Relationships,” states:

26 (a) A multiple relationship occurs when a psychologist is in a professional role
27 with a person and (1) at the same time is in another role with the same person, (2) at
28 the same time is in a relationship with a person closely associated with or related to
the person with whom the psychologist has the professional relationship, or (3)
promises to enter into another relationship in the future with the person or a person
closely associated with or related to the person.

A psychologist refrains from entering into a multiple relationship if the multiple
relationship could reasonably be expected to impair the psychologist's objectivity,
competence, or effectiveness in performing his or her functions as a psychologist, or
otherwise risks exploitation or harm to the person with whom the professional
relationship exists.

Multiple relationships that would not reasonably be expected to cause
impairment or risk exploitation or harm are not unethical.

(b) If a psychologist finds that, due to unforeseen factors, a potentially harmful
multiple relationship has arisen, the psychologist takes reasonable steps to resolve it

1 with due regard for the best interests of the affected person and maximal compliance
2 with the Ethics Code.

3 (c) When psychologists are required by law, institutional policy, or
4 extraordinary circumstances to serve in more than one role in judicial or
5 administrative proceedings, at the outset they clarify role expectations and the extent
6 of confidentiality and thereafter as changes occur. (See also Standards 3.04,
7 Avoiding Harm, and 3.07, Third-Party Requests for Services.)

8 8. APA Ethical Principles, Standard 3.06, "Conflict of Interest," states:

9 Psychologists refrain from taking on a professional role when personal,
10 scientific, professional, legal, financial, or other interests or relationships could
11 reasonably be expected to (1) impair their objectivity, competence, or effectiveness in
12 performing their functions as psychologists or (2) expose the person or organization
13 with whom the professional relationship exists to harm or exploitation.

14 9. APA Ethical Principles, Standard 3.08, "Exploitative Relationships," states:

15 Psychologists do not exploit persons over whom they have supervisory,
16 evaluative or other authority such as clients/patients, students, supervisees, research
17 participants, and employees.

18 10. California Rule of Court, Rule 5.220, states:

19 (a) Authority: This rule of court is adopted under Family Code sections 211
20 and 3117.

21 (b) Purpose: Courts order child custody evaluations, investigations, and
22 assessments to assist them in determining the health, safety, welfare, and best
23 interests of children with regard to disputed custody and visitation issues. This rule
24 governs both court-connected and private child custody evaluators appointed under
25 Family Code section 3111, Family Code section 3118, Evidence Code 730, or chapter
26 15 (commencing with section 2032.010) of title 4, part 4 of the Code of Civil
27 Procedure.

28 (c) Definitions: For purposes of this rule:

(1) A "child custody evaluator" is a court-appointed investigator as defined in
Family Code section 3110.

(2) The "best interest of the child" is as defined in Family Code section 3011.

(3) A "child custody evaluation" is an expert investigation and analysis of the
health, safety, welfare, and best interest of children with regard to disputed custody
and visitation issues.

(4) A "full evaluation, investigation, or assessment" is a comprehensive
examination of the health, safety, welfare, and best interest of the child.

(5) A "partial evaluation, investigation, or assessment" is an examination of the
health, safety, welfare, and best interest of the child that is limited by court order

1 in either time or scope.

2 (6) "Evaluation," "investigation," and "assessment" are synonymous.

3 (d) Responsibility for evaluation services:

4 (1) Each court must:

5 (A) Adopt a local rule by January 1, 2000, to:

6 (i) Implement this rule of court;

7 (ii) Determine whether a peremptory challenge to a court-appointed evaluator is
8 allowed and when the challenge must be exercised. The rules must specify
9 whether a family court services staff member, other county employee, a mental
10 health professional, or all of them may be challenged;

11 (iii) Allow evaluators to petition the court to withdraw from a case;

12 (iv) Provide for acceptance of and response to complaints about an evaluator's
13 performance; and

14 (v) Address ex parte communications.

15 (B) Give the evaluator, before the evaluation begins, a copy of the court order that
16 specifies:

17 (i) The appointment of the evaluator under Evidence Code section 730, Family
18 Code section 3110, or Code of Civil Procedure 2031; and

19 (ii) The purpose and scope of the evaluation.

20 (C) Require child custody evaluators to adhere to the requirements of this rule.

21 (D) Determine and allocate between the parties any fees or costs of the evaluation.

22 (2) The child custody evaluator must:

23 (A) Consider the health, safety, welfare, and best interest of the child within the
24 scope and purpose of the evaluation as defined by the court order;

25 (B) Strive to minimize the potential for psychological trauma to children during
26 the evaluation process;

27 (C) Include in the initial meeting with each child an age-appropriate explanation
28 of the evaluation process, including limitations on the confidentiality of the
process;

(D) Inform the parties, other professionals serving on the case, and the judicial

1 officer about the child's desire to provide input and address the court; and

2 (E) If so informed by the child at any point, provide notice that the child has
3 changed their choice about addressing the court. Notice must be provided as soon
4 as feasible to the parties or their attorneys, other professionals serving on the case,
5 and then to the judicial officer.

6 (e) Scope of evaluations: All evaluations must include:

7 (1) A written explanation of the process that clearly describes the:

8 (A) Purpose of the evaluation;

9 (B) Procedures used and the time required to gather and assess information and, if
10 psychological tests will be used, the role of the results in confirming or
11 questioning other information or previous conclusions;

12 (C) Scope and distribution of the evaluation report;

13 (D) Limitations on the confidentiality of the process; and

14 (E) Cost and payment responsibility for the evaluation.

15 (2) Data collection and analysis that are consistent with the requirements of
16 Family Code section 3118; that allow the evaluator to observe and consider each
17 party in comparable ways and to substantiate (from multiple sources when
18 possible) interpretations and conclusions regarding each child's developmental
19 needs; the quality of attachment to each parent and that parent's social
20 environment; and reactions to the separation, divorce, or parental conflict. This
21 process may include:

22 (A) Reviewing pertinent documents related to custody, including local police
23 records;

24 (B) Observing parent-child interaction (unless contraindicated to protect the best
25 interest of the child);

26 (C) Interviewing parents conjointly, individually, or both conjointly and
27 individually (unless contraindicated in cases involving domestic violence), to
28 assess:

(i) Capacity for setting age-appropriate limits and for understanding and
responding to the child's needs;

(ii) History of involvement in caring for the child;

(iii) Methods for working toward resolution of the child custody conflict;

(iv) History of child abuse, domestic violence, substance abuse, and psychiatric

1 illness; and

2 (v) Psychological and social functioning;

3 (D) Conducting age-appropriate interviews and observation with the children,
4 both parents, stepparents, step- and half-siblings conjointly, separately, or both
5 conjointly and separately, unless contraindicated to protect the best interest of the
6 child;

7 (E) Collecting relevant corroborating information or documents as permitted by
8 law; and

9 (F) Consulting with other experts to develop information that is beyond the
10 evaluator's scope of practice or area of expertise.

11 (f) Presentation of findings: All evaluations must include a written or oral
12 presentation of findings that is consistent with Family Code section 3111, Family
13 Code section 3118, or Evidence Code section 730. In any presentation of findings,
14 the evaluator must do all of the following:

15 (1) Summarize the data-gathering procedures, information sources, and time
16 spent, and present all relevant information, including information that does not
17 support the conclusions reached;

18 (2) Describe any limitations in the evaluation that result from unobtainable
19 information, failure of a party to cooperate, or the circumstances of particular
20 interviews;

21 (3) Only make a custody or visitation recommendation for a party who has been
22 evaluated. This requirement does not preclude the evaluator from making an
23 interim recommendation that is in the best interests of the child; and

24 (4) Provide clear, detailed recommendations that are consistent with the health,
25 safety, welfare, and best interests of the child if making any recommendations to
26 the court regarding a parenting plan.

27 (g) Confidential written report; requirements:

28 (1) *Family Code section 3111 evaluations.* An evaluator appointed under Family
Code section 3111 must do all of the following:

(A) File and serve a report on the parties or their attorneys and any attorney
appointed for the child under Family Code section 3150; and

(B) Attach a *Notice Regarding Confidentiality of Child Custody Evaluation
Report Under Family Code section 3111* (form FL-328) as the first page of the
child custody evaluation report when a court-ordered child custody evaluation
report is filed with the clerk of the court and served on the parties or their
attorneys, and any counsel appointed for the child, to inform them of the

1 confidential nature of the report and the potential consequences for the
2 unwarranted disclosure of the report.

3 (2) *Family Code section 3118 evaluations.* An evaluator appointed to conduct a
4 child custody evaluation, investigation, or assessment based on (1) a serious
5 allegation of child sexual abuse or (2) an allegation of child abuse under Family Code
6 section 3118 must do all of the following:

7 (A) Provide a full and complete analysis of the allegations raised in the
8 proceeding and address the health, safety, welfare, and best interests of the child,
9 as ordered by the court; and

10 (B) Complete, file, and serve *Confidential Child Custody Evaluation Report*
11 *Under Family Code section 3118* (form FL-329) on the parties or their attorneys
12 and any attorney appointed for the child under Family Code section 3150.

13 (h) *Cooperation with professionals in another jurisdiction:* When one party
14 resides in another jurisdiction, the custody evaluator may rely on another qualified
15 neutral professional for assistance in gathering information. In order to ensure a
16 thorough and comparably reliable out-of-jurisdiction evaluation, the evaluator must:

17 (1) Make a written request that includes, as appropriate:

18 (A) A copy of all relevant court orders;

19 (B) An outline of issues to be explored;

20 (C) A list of the individuals who must or may be contacted;

21 (D) A description of the necessary structure and setting for interviews;

22 (E) A statement as to whether a home visit is required;

23 (F) A request for relevant documents such as police records, school reports, or
24 other document review; and

25 (G) A request that a written report be returned only to the evaluator and that no
26 copies of the report be distributed to parties or attorneys;

27 (2) Provide instructions that limit the out-of-jurisdiction report to factual matters
28 and behavioral observations rather than recommendations regarding the overall
custody plan; and

(3) Attach and discuss the report provided by the professional in another
jurisdiction in the evaluator's final report.

(i) *Requirements for evaluator qualifications, training, continuing education,
and experience:* All child custody evaluators must meet the qualifications, training,
and continuing education requirements specified in Family Code sections 1815, 1816,

and 3111 and rules 5.225 and 5.230.

(j) Ethics: In performing an evaluation, the child custody evaluator must:

(1) Maintain objectivity, provide and gather balanced information for both parties, and control for bias;

(2) Protect the confidentiality of the parties and children in collateral contacts and not release information about the case to any individual except as authorized by the court or statute;

(3) Not offer any recommendations about a party unless that party has been evaluated directly or in consultation with another qualified neutral professional;

(4) Consider the health, safety, welfare, and best interest of the child in all phases of the process, including interviews with parents, extended family members, counsel for the child, and other interested parties or collateral contacts;

(5) Strive to maintain the confidential relationship between the child who is the subject of an evaluation and his or her treating psychotherapist;

(6) Operate within the limits of the evaluator's training and experience and disclose any limitations or bias that would affect the evaluator's ability to conduct the evaluation;

(7) Not pressure children to state a custodial preference;

(8) Inform the parties of the evaluator's reporting requirements, including, but not limited to, suspected child abuse and neglect and threats to harm one's self or another person;

(9) Not disclose any recommendations to the parties, their attorneys, or the attorney for the child before having gathered the information necessary to support the conclusion;

(10) Disclose to the court, parties, attorney for a party, and attorney for the child conflicts of interest or dual relationships; and not accept any appointment except by court order or the parties' stipulation; and

(11) Be sensitive to the socioeconomic status, gender, race, ethnicity, cultural values, religion, family structures, and developmental characteristics of the parties.

(k) Cost-effective procedures for cross-examination of evaluators: Each local court must develop procedures for expeditious and cost-effective cross-examination of evaluators, including, but not limited to, consideration of the following:

(1) Videoconferences;

- 1 (2) Telephone conferences;
2 (3) Audio or video examination; and
3 (4) Scheduling of appearances.

4 **COST RECOVERY**

5 11. Section 125.3 of the Code states, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the
6 administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or violations of
7 the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and
8 enforcement of the case.

9 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10 12. Respondent is a psychologist who maintains a private practice in Riverside,
11 California. Prior to becoming a licensed psychologist, Respondent was a lawyer. According to
12 the California State Bar website, Respondent was licensed to practice as an attorney on December
13 4, 2000. The California State Bar website indicates that Respondent's law license remains active
14 and is in good standing. Among other things, Respondent practiced family law. Thereafter,
15 Respondent obtained his degree and became a Marriage and Family Therapist. According to the
16 California Board of Behavioral Sciences, Respondent was licensed as a Marriage and Family
17 Therapist on April 30, 2015; that license is current and expires on June 30, 2026.

18 13. On or about January 27, 2021, upon stipulation of the parties for a full child custody
19 evaluation, Respondent was appointed by the Riverside Superior Court-Family Law Courthouse,
20 to conduct a Child Custody Evaluation pursuant to Evidence Code section 730 ("730 Report"), in
21 case number RID XXX2381. The purpose of the evaluation and 730 Report was to assist the
22 Court in determining custody of the divorced couple's four-year-old child. At the time of the
23 appointment and evaluation, the parents shared equal legal custody of the child, but the Custodial
24 Parent had sole physical custody of the child and the Non-Custodial Parent had supervised
25 visitation of the child two days a week, each visit lasting two hours. The child and Custodial
26 Parent resided with the child's maternal grandparents and the divorced couple's two-year-old
27 child (custody was not at issue).
28

1 14. In preparing the 730 Report, Respondent interviewed the parents and other witnesses;
2 the child was not interviewed. Respondent was given documents, photographs, and videos from
3 the parents, court documents, police reports, and reports from child protective services, etc., some
4 of which he carefully reviewed and others that were given a cursory review. Some of the
5 information was quoted in the 730 Report and other information was purposely omitted or
6 incorrectly cited. For example, the Custodial Parent submitted numerous documents for
7 Respondent's review, but there is no mention of the majority of her documentation in the 730
8 Report. There was no information in the 730 Report regarding the Non-Custodial Parent's
9 criminal history. Information regarding the Non-Custodial Parent's abuse of the Custodial Parent
10 is not mentioned or de-emphasized in the 730 Report. Additionally, Respondent failed to
11 document that the Non-Custodial Parent violated a Family Court Order and removed the child
12 across state lines. There is no mention in the 730 Report that as a consequence of violating the
13 Court Order, the Non-Custodial Parent lost her fifty percent visitation and was placed on reduced
14 number of monitored visits. Respondent also received information that the Custodial Parent had
15 been sexually abused as a child. Respondent failed to confront the Custodial Parent or her
16 parents, whom he interviewed, regarding this allegation. Respondent also misquoted the
17 Custodial Parent's neighbor's statements obtained during his interview.

18 15. Regarding the allegation of domestic violence between the parents, Respondent failed
19 to conduct an assessment for domestic violence, including the administration of unbiased testing,
20 such as the use of Domestic Violence Evaluation Screening/Assessment Tools. Instead of
21 administering recognized domestic violence assessment screening/testing, Respondent
22 administered the Adult Attachment Interview, which is not a professionally accepted forensic
23 tool. The Adult Attachment Interview is simply an interview tool.

24 16. In the 730 Report he prepared for the Court, Respondent was required to include all
25 information that supports his findings, including information that does not support the
26 conclusions he reached. Respondent admitted under oath that he did not document in the 730
27 Report an analysis of the detrimental effect that a change in physical custody would have on the
28 child.

1 17. Respondent rendered the expert opinion that the Non-Custodial Parent should be
2 awarded sole legal and physical custody of the child. Respondent further opined that the
3 Custodial Parent should have monitored visits, twice weekly for two hours each visit, among
4 other recommendations regarding visitation.

5 18. Respondent also recommended that the Custodial Parent receive no less than 16-
6 weeks of Circle of Security Parenting classes from Dorothy Husen, LMFT, to be followed by
7 Dorothy Husen, LMFT's Parenting Myself Securely class. Respondent disclosed that Dorothy
8 Husen, LMFT is his wife and that he has indirect monetary gain from the referral.

9 19. During his interview with the Board's investigator Respondent admitted that, "It was
10 kind of dumb of me [to make the referral]. ... I should have known better at the time, but I just
11 didn't."

12 20. On or about December 10, 2021, the Superior Court awarded sole legal and physical
13 custody of the child to the Custodial Parent. The Non-Custodial Parent was awarded visitation on
14 the first and third weekends of each month and every Wednesday.

15 **Standard of Care**

16 21. The standard of care for psychologists in conducting child custody evaluations in
17 California is Rule 5.220 of the California Rules of Court. The Rule specifically indicates what all
18 evaluations must include and also lists processes psychologists may use. The Rule also includes a
19 list of eleven ethical principles to which a child custody evaluator must maintain and adhere.

20 22. In addition, psychologists conducting child custody evaluations are required to adhere
21 to the APA Ethical Principles, as these Ethical Principles have been incorporated into the standard
22 of care in California.

23 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

24 **(Unprofessional Conduct - Gross Negligence)**

25 23. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2960, subdivision (j)
26 of the Code in that he was grossly negligent in the practice of his profession, as more particularly
27 alleged hereinafter: The circumstances are as follows:

28 ///

1 24. Paragraphs 12 through 22 are incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set
2 forth.

3 25. Respondent's recommendation in the 730 Report to the Court that the Custodial
4 Parent receive therapy from his wife is an extreme departure from the standard of care.

5 26. Respondent was grossly negligent in violating APA Ethical Principles, Standard 3.05,
6 "Multiple Relationships," in that Respondent's conduct was unethical, and he admitted that he
7 was "dumb" and implicitly acknowledged that he should not have made the referral.

8 27. Respondent was grossly negligent in violating APA Ethical Principles, Standard 3.06,
9 "Conflict of Interest," in that Respondent's conduct was a conflict of interest. In the 730 Report,
10 Respondent acknowledged that he had a financial conflict of interest in referring the Custodial
11 Parent to his wife for therapy. Again, during his interview with the Board's investigator,
12 Respondent acknowledged that his referral of the Custodial Parent to his wife for therapy was a
13 conflict of interest.

14 28. Respondent was grossly negligent in violating APA Ethical Principles, Standard 3.08,
15 "Exploitative Relationships," in that Respondent's conduct was a conflict of interest resulting in
16 an exploitative relationship. In the 730 Report, Respondent acknowledged that he had a financial
17 conflict of interest in referring the Custodial Parent to his wife for therapy. Again, during his
18 interview with the Board's investigator, Respondent acknowledged that his referral of the
19 Custodial Parent to his wife for therapy was a conflict of interest. These conflicts of interest
20 resulted in an exploitative relationship with the Custodial Parent, especially after Respondent
21 recommended to the Court that the child be removed from her home.

22 **SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

23 **(Unprofessional Conduct - Repeated Negligent Acts)**

24 29. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2960, subdivision (r).
25 The circumstances are as follows:

26 30. Paragraphs 12 through 22 are incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set
27 forth.

28 ///

1 31. The allegations of the First Cause for Discipline are incorporated by reference and
2 realleged as if fully set forth.

3 32. Each of the alleged acts of gross negligence set forth in the First Cause for Discipline,
4 above, is also a negligent act.

5 33. Respondent also failed to adhere to California Rule of Court, Rule 5.220 in his
6 preparation of the 730 Report.

7 **THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

8 **(Violating any Rule of Professional Conduct)**

9 34. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2960, subdivisions (i)
10 and (k), and Code section 2936, in that he violated certain provisions of the APA Ethical
11 Principals. The circumstances are as follows:

12 35. Paragraphs 12 through 22 are incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set
13 forth.

14 36. The allegations of the First and Second Causes for Discipline are incorporated by
15 reference and realleged as if fully set forth.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

17 **(Violating any Rule of Professional Conduct)**

18 37. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2960, subdivisions (i)
19 and (k), and California Rule of Court, Rule 5.220, in that he violated the standard of care as set
20 forth in Rule 5.220. The circumstances are as follows:

21 38. Paragraphs 12 through 22 are incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set
22 forth.

23 39. The allegations of the First, Second and Third Causes for Discipline are incorporated
24 by reference and realleged as if fully set forth.

25 **FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

26 **(General Unprofessional Conduct)**

27 40. Respondent has further subjected his license to disciplinary action under section 2960
28 of the Code, in that he has engaged in conduct that breaches the rules or ethical code of the

1 profession, or conduct which is unbecoming to a member in good standing of the profession, and
2 which demonstrates an unfitness to practice psychology, as more particularly alleged in
3 paragraphs 12 through 38, above, which are incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set
4 forth herein.

5 **PRAYER**


6 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,
7 and that following the hearing, the Board of Psychology issue a decision:

8 1. Revoking or suspending Psychologist License Number PSY 30102, issued to James
9 Husen, Psy.D.;

10 2. Ordering James C. Husen, Psy.D. to pay the Board of Psychology the reasonable
11 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and, if placed on probation, the costs of
12 probation monitoring; and,

13 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

14
15
16 DATED: July 17, 2024



ANTONETTE SORRICK
Executive Officer
Board of Psychology
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

17
18
19
20
21 LA2024603141
22
23
24
25
26
27
28