

IN THE MATTER OF * BEFORE THE
LISA SHARLENE MILLER, LSWA * MARYLAND STATE BOARD
Respondent * OF SOCIAL WORK EXAMINERS
License Number: A04889 * Case Number: 990

* * * * *

ORDER OF REVOCATION

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

BACKGROUND

On December 22, 2006, the Maryland State Board of Social Work Examiners (the "Board") issued charges against Lisa Sharlene Miller, LSWA (the "Respondent") pursuant to its authority under the Maryland Social Work Practice Act (the "Act"), Maryland Health Occ. Code Ann., ("H.O.") §§19-101 et seq., (2000 Repl. Vol.). Specifically, the Board charged Respondent with violating the following provisions of H.O. §19-311:

Subject to the hearing provisions of §19-312 of this subtitle, the Board may deny a license to any applicant, reprimand any licensee, place any licensee on probation, or suspend or revoke a license if the applicant or licensee:

- (4) Commits any act of gross negligence, incompetence, or misconduct in the practice of social work;
- (5) Knowingly violates any provision of this title;
- (6) Engages in a course of conduct that is inconsistent with generally accepted professional standards in the practice of social work;
- (7) Violates any provision of this title or regulations governing the practice of social work adopted and published by the Board;
- (12) Knowingly makes or files a false report or record in the practice of social work;

(17) Fails to cooperate with a lawful investigation of the Board [;].

The Board also charged Respondent with violating the Code of Ethics, Code Md. Regs. ("COMAR") tit. 10 § 42.03 (1993). The relevant provisions are as follows:

.03 General Conduct.

B. In the capacity of or identity as a licensed social worker, the licensee may not:

(1) Participate or condone dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation[;].

Included with the Charges to Respondent was a letter of procedure informing Respondent that she may attend a Case Resolution Conference ("CRC") on January 30, 2007, if she requests it in writing within ten (10) days of receipt of the Charges. The Charges and letter of procedure were sent to Respondent by regular and certified mail to the address that Respondent provided to the Board on her most recent renewal application.

On January 23, 2007, the certified copy of the Charges and accompanying letter of procedure were returned to the Board. The documents that were mailed regular mail were not returned.

Respondent did not request a CRC. On January 30, 2007, the CRC was convened, however, the Respondent failed to appear.

On February 1, 2007, the Board sent correspondence by regular mail to Respondent advising her that the CRC was convened, but, since she failed to appear, the case was proceeding to a hearing at the Office of Administrative Hearings ("OAH"). This correspondence was returned to the Board on February 13, 2007, and the outside

of the envelope was stamped, "Return to Sender Attempted Not Known Unable to Forward."

On March 1, 2007, the Board issued to Respondent, by regular and certified mail, to her last known address, a Notice of Hearing, advising her of the dates of the Pre-Hearing Conference and the Hearing in the above-captioned matter. The certified mail was delivered on March 12, 2007. On March 5, 2007, OAH issued to Respondent a Notice of Hearing and Notice of Pre-Hearing Conference with instructions. Respondent failed to contact OAH and the Administrative Prosecutor pursuant to those instructions.

On April 5, 2007, a Pre-Hearing Conference was held before Administrative Law Judge Yolanda Curtin. Respondent failed to appear. The Administrative Prosecutor appeared and was ready to proceed. Accordingly, the Administrative Prosecutor made Motion for Proposed Default, which the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") granted pursuant to COMAR 28.02.01.20A.

On April 11, 2007, the ALJ issued a Proposed Default Order wherein she concluded that the Respondent be found in default and that the Charges issued by the Board on December 22, 2006 be upheld. The ALJ further concluded and proposed that Respondent's license to practice social work in the State of Maryland be revoked.

In the Proposed Default Order, the ALJ also informed the Respondent of the right to file Exceptions to the proposed decision within fifteen (15) days from the date of the Proposed Default Order.

On May 11, 2007, with the Respondent having filed no exceptions, a majority of the full authorized membership of the Board voted to affirm the ALJ's Proposed Default Order and to revoke Respondent's license to practice social work. The Board issues

this Final Decision and Order based upon its consideration of the entire record, including the Proposed Default Order, the State's Motion for Default and exhibits. For the reasons set forth below, the Board adopts the ALJ's Proposed Default Order in its entirety. The ALJ's Proposed Default Order is attached and incorporated herein as Appendix A.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board makes the following findings of fact:

1. Respondent was originally issued a license to practice associate social work in the State of Maryland on September 9, 2002, being issued license number A04889. Respondent last renewed her license in or about October 2004, which expired on October 30, 2006. To date, Respondent has not renewed her license.¹

2. At all times relevant to these charges, Respondent was employed by Anne Arundel County Department of Social Services ("DSS"). Respondent was initially hired in July 2002 as a Family Service Caseworker trainee. In September 2002, Respondent was reclassified to a Caseworker II. Her duties were to investigate allegations of child abuse and neglect.

3. During Summer 2004, Respondent applied for and was accepted into the graduate social work program at University of Maryland School of Social Work.²

¹ Beginning Spring 2005, Respondent became employed in a non-social work occupation.

² In Fall 2002, Respondent attended graduate school fulltime and in Spring 2003, Respondent attended part time. Respondent did not attend graduate school in Fall 2003 or Spring 2004. In Fall 2004, Respondent attended full time, in Spring 2005 she attended part time, in Fall 2005 she attended full time and in Spring 2006, she attended part time, for a total of 45 credits. Respondent has not graduated.

4. In or about Summer 2004, Respondent arranged with DSS to use her annual leave, or work on Saturdays, to make up for the hours she was away for her academic field placement outside DSS.

5. Respondent requested, and was granted permission, to work for DSS "after hours service" to supplement her earnings and to be able to access the DSS computer system from her home.

6. On November 19, 2004, Respondent submitted a resignation letter to DSS. Her last day of employment at DSS was December 10, 2004.

7. On or about October 21, 2005, the Board received a written Complaint from the Director of DSS regarding Respondent. The Director stated that Respondent "failed to make an appropriate response" to a case in September 2004. In addition, after her resignation, DSS determined that in ten (10) cases closed by Respondent, the families had no knowledge of investigations involving their children. Respondent, however, had submitted reports giving detailed information of interviews and other activities she had conducted that apparently had never taken place.

8. Thereafter, the Board initiated an investigation of the Complaint. As part of the investigation, the Board subpoenaed the complete client files that were referenced in the Complaint, and the Board investigator interviewed Respondent's supervisor.

9. On or about September 27, 2004, while home on sick leave, Respondent's supervisor spoke with her by telephone. Respondent was to return to work the next day, September 28, and was scheduled on "coverage" to receive new

cases. The supervisor also asked Respondent to make a contact on a case for a co-worker who was on leave.

10. Respondent's supervisor was on leave on September 28, 2004.

11. On or about September 28, 2004, Respondent did not come into the DSS office.

12. On or about September 28, 2004, Respondent had been assigned a new case. Respondent informed the unit secretary that she had accessed the DSS computer system from her home, and she had obtained the necessary information to respond to the new case that had been assigned to her.

13. The DSS supervisors that were covering for Respondent's supervisor contacted the DSS Information Management staff and were informed that Respondent had not logged into the DSS computer system on September 28, 2004.

14. In or about October 2004, when interviewed by her supervisor, Respondent stated that she forgot to make contact on her co-worker's case. Respondent stated that she, however, had made a response on September 28 to the new case that had been assigned to her on September 28.

15. Respondent's supervisor contacted the school of the identified child and was unable to confirm that Respondent had made a response to the allegation on September 28, 2004. Respondent's supervisor advised Respondent that staff had informed her that Respondent had not been logged into the DSS computer system and had not made a contact on her case on September 28, 2004.

16. On or about October 25, 2004, Respondent's supervisor received a report of abuse/neglect on a case that Respondent had recently closed. In her closed report,

Respondent listed the children in the family as a teenage girl and two young boys. In a new referral on the family, the younger children were described as two young girls. When her supervisor confronted Respondent about the discrepancy, Respondent said that she had been busy and listed both of the younger children as boys by mistake.

17. In or about mid-November 2004, Respondent's supervisor advised Respondent that as a result of the above described events, she had little faith in Respondent's integrity.

18. On or about November 19, 2004, Respondent submitted her resignation to DSS.

19. On or about November 19, 2004, Respondent had 25 assigned cases to close. By the end of November 2005, Respondent had closed 18 cases. On or about December 9, 2005, Respondent closed 3 more cases.

20. On or about December 10, 2005 was Respondent's last day of work at DSS.

21. On or about December 14 and 15, 2005, Respondent's supervisor closed 3 additional cases. Respondent's supervisor reviewed Respondent's closed cases and discovered a case where she could not determine if the notice of appeal had been mailed to the client. Respondent's supervisor sent the notice of appeal to the client.

22. On or about December 27, 2005, the client contacted DSS stating she had never heard of Respondent and did not know anything about an abuse investigation.

23. Thereafter, DSS conducted a review of Respondent's closed cases. DSS sent approximately 30 letters to Respondent's closed cases, and, in addition,

Respondent's supervisor called approximately 6 former clients to obtain feedback on the clients' interaction with DSS.

24. Ten (10) clients responded to the letters and calls stating that they had not met Respondent and knew nothing about a contact by a DSS social worker.

25. Of those ten (10) clients, pursuant to the Board's subpoena, DSS submitted to the Board eight (8) of the ten (10) "Child Abuse – Report Disposition" reports (the "Reports") with Respondent's name as the responsible social worker. Respondent prepared two of the Reports in April 2004, one in May 2004, two in August 2004, two in October 2004 and one in November 2004.³

26. Respondent's Reports of the eight (8) cases contain detailed information of historical information, contents of in-person interviews and descriptions of home visits and other contacts.

27. Beginning in January 2005, as part of DSS's review, Respondent's supervisor and three other DSS social workers conducted "follow-up" investigative interviews of the eight clients and determined that Respondent had not interviewed these clients and that Respondent had prepared fictitious and fabricated reports.

28. Pursuant to the Board's subpoena, DSS submitted to the Board the reports of the follow-up interviews.

29. A comparison of Respondent's Reports with the subsequent follow-up investigative reports are as follows:

³ One of the ten (10) clients had moved out of state and the other was not available for a follow-up interview.

Case A⁴

30. In a Report prepared by Respondent on November 4, 2004, Respondent stated that she interviewed both parents separately. The parents are divorced but have joint custody. The mother had filed the complaint against the father. Respondent documented that she interviewed the identified child, an eight-year-old boy, and his ten-year-old half-brother. Respondent concluded that a finding of abuse was "indicated," meaning that it was her professional assessment that the eight year old boy was physically abused, based on evidence of current injury. Respondent identified the child's father as the alleged abuser.

31. A subsequent investigation by Respondent's supervisor on February 23, 2005, resulted in a finding of "unsubstantiated," meaning the case would be closed. Respondent's supervisor stated that the father and both boys denied meeting Respondent. Respondent interviewed only the child's mother.

Case B

32. Respondent prepared a Report on October 28, 2004, regarding a police report of a seven-year-old male child who had been left unattended in a vehicle with the keys in the vehicle. Respondent documented that she made an unannounced home visit and spoke with the mother and the child. Respondent stated that she made a second home visit and spoke with the mother, stepfather, and child. Respondent reported that a finding of child neglect was "indicated" because the stepfather left his 7-year-old step-son unattended in his car while he attended a community college class in

⁴ Family case names are confidential and are not included in this Order of Revocation.

the evening. Respondent identified the father as the alleged neglecter because he failed to provide proper care and attention.

33. A subsequent investigation on March 30, 2005 by another DSS social worker, Social Worker 1⁵, had a finding of "unsubstantiated." The social worker met with the mother, stepfather and the child in the home who stated they had never spoken with Respondent. The social worker interviewed the parents and the child and closed the case because there was not sufficient evidence to support a finding of neglect.

Case C

34. In a Report prepared by Respondent on October 19, 2004, regarding a complaint that an individual struck his 15-year-old stepdaughter causing bruising on her arms, Respondent documented that she interviewed the mother and her stepfather together at their home and gave a lengthy, detailed description of the interview. Respondent stated that she interviewed the 15-year-old girl privately in her room and documented details of the altercation between the girl and her stepfather. Respondent stated that she had several subsequent visits with the couple at their home. Respondent reported that a finding of abuse was "indicated."

35. In a subsequent investigation on February 8, 2005, Respondent's supervisor met with the parents who denied that Respondent had ever been to their home in response to the incident between the stepfather and 15-year-old child. The mother stated that due to their work schedules, it would be impossible for her and her husband to be interviewed together. Respondent's supervisor interviewed the mother and stepfather and subsequently interviewed the stepdaughter alone. Respondent's

⁵ The names of Respondent's supervisor and the names of the social workers who conducted the follow-up interviews are not included in this Order of Revocation for purposes of confidentiality.

supervisor reported a finding of “unsubstantiated⁶” and determined that the case should be closed because there is no evidence that the stepfather caused bruises on the stepdaughter’s arm.

Case D

36. In a Report prepared by Respondent on December 10, 2004, regarding a report of neglect from the school of a mentally retarded 15-year-old student, Respondent documented that she went to the child’s school and obtained information from a classroom assistant. Respondent also documented she spoke with the child’s step-mother at the home who told her the child recently had an infection in his shunt, and she had taken him to his pediatrician. Respondent documented she confirmed this with the pediatrician’s office. Respondent documented that she had telephone contact with the child’s father, and she made a home visit where the parents and child were present. Respondent stated that the child “chatted” with her about his day. Respondent reported that neglect was “ruled out,” and a report of child abuse was “unsubstantiated.”

37. In a subsequent investigation on March 28, 2005 by a DSS social worker, Social Worker 2, the social worker interviewed the stepmother and father, with the child present. The parents stated they had never met Respondent, and the information in her Report was “made up.” The child is not able to have a conversation and does not presently have a pediatrician. According to the stepmother, no one ever spoke with the child’s teacher about a DSS referral. The social worker made a finding of “ruled out” on the report of neglect and the report of child abuse.

⁶ Respondent’s supervisor could not “rule out” the abuse because of evidence of a struggle with the stepdaughter, which may have caused the bruises.

Case E

38. In a Report prepared by Respondent on June 24, 2004, regarding young children being allowed to play outside in the street unsupervised, Respondent documented that she interviewed the mother and two young children, ages 4 and 6. Respondent described a detailed interview with each child. Respondent documented a subsequent phone conversation with the mother and a phone interview with the father. Respondent reported that a finding of neglect was "unsubstantiated" because neither child was injured due to lack of supervision, but it could not be "ruled out" because there was evidence the children were riding their bikes unattended. Respondent identified the parents as alleged neglecters.

39. In a subsequent investigation on June 19, 2005 by Social Worker 1, the mother and both of the children stated that they had not spoken with a DSS worker about being unsupervised. The children denied being left alone. The social worker reported a finding of "ruled out," meaning that neglect did not occur, and there were no neglecters identified.

Case F

40. In a Report prepared by Respondent on August 20, 2004, regarding a six year old female child who told the school nurse that she had a bump on her head, and her father threw a videotape that hit her by accident, Respondent documented that she went to the school and spoke with the child, and then she went to the home and spoke with the mother who thought the incident was an accident. Respondent documented that she subsequently made an unannounced home visit and met with the parents and the child and that the father told her the incident was a "big misunderstanding."

Respondent reported that the abuse was “unsubstantiated” because there was no credible account from the child and there was no witness, but that abuse could not be ruled out because the child had a cut on her head as a result of the incident. Respondent reported the child abuse was unsubstantiated and identified the father (mother’s boyfriend) as the alleged abuser.

41. In a subsequent investigation on May 12, 2005 by Respondent’s supervisor, the mother told the supervisor that she was not aware of any investigation of the incident. A DSS social worker, Social Worker 3, was re-assigned to the case to arrange a home visit but was unable to do so due to the family having moved. Social Worker 3 reported a finding of “ruled out” because the investigation was incomplete.

Case G

42. Respondent prepared a Report on October 7, 2004 regarding a complaint of neglect made by the mother of two boys who are in the custody of their father and step-mother, alleging that the stepmother smokes crack in front of the 13-year-old son. Respondent documented that she spoke with the 13-year-old boy at his school and that she subsequently spoke with the mother and the 13-year-old on the phone. Respondent documented that on later dates she spoke with the father on the phone and made an unannounced home visit. Respondent reported that a finding of neglect was “indicated,” and in her professional opinion, there was credible evidence that the child was neglected. Respondent identified the child’s stepmother as the alleged neglecter.

43. In a subsequent investigation on April 28, 2005, Respondent’s supervisor contacted the stepmother who stated she knew nothing about a DSS investigation although she acknowledged problems with her stepson. The father stated that no social

worker had met with him regarding the allegations. Subsequently, the supervisor had many contacts with the family and the son. The supervisor reported the finding of "unsubstantiated" because she got different stories from everyone. Nevertheless, there was too much evidence to rule out neglect. The supervisor identified the stepmother as the alleged neglecter.

Case H

44. Respondent prepared a report on November 8, 2004 regarding a complaint of neglect because the parents had been leaving their five children alone for hours at a time, there was inadequate food, the home often was without gas and electric, the children did not attend school and the parents used drugs. Respondent documented that she went to the home unannounced and spoke with the mother. The mother showed Respondent that there was food in the refrigerator. The mother acknowledged that the 13-year-old daughter baby-sits the younger children, the gas and electric have been turned off at times, and she has trouble getting her two oldest daughters to school. Respondent documented that she spoke with one of the children. Respondent documented that she made a subsequent unannounced home visit and interviewed the oldest two daughters. Respondent documented that she met with both parents on a third home visit. Respondent reported a finding of unsubstantiated child neglect and identified the parents as the alleged neglecters.

45. In a subsequent investigation on May 3, 2005, Respondent's supervisor spoke with the mother by telephone who stated that she was never visited by anyone with regard to a neglect complaint, which likely made by a problem neighbor. On May 11, 2005, the supervisor spoke with the father by telephone who stated he had never

met Respondent and that when his family lived in Anne Arundel County, his wife did not work and was always home with the children. The supervisor referred the case to the appropriate agency in Virginia where the family was then residing. The supervisor reported that the complaint of neglect was unsubstantiated because the investigation could not be completed.

46. On February 9, 2006, the Board investigator sent correspondence to Respondent at her address of record with the Board, notifying her of the receipt of the Complaint.

47. Respondent did not respond, and, on February 20, 2006, the Board investigator re-sent the correspondence to Respondent and left a message on her home telephone.

48. On February 23, 2006, Respondent contacted the Board investigator and agreed to be interviewed at the Board on March 13, 2006 and provided her cell phone number.

49. On March 13, 2006, Respondent failed to appear for the interview.

50. On March 15, 2006, the Board investigator left a message on Respondent's cell phone.

51. Respondent failed to call the Board investigator.

52. On March 20, 2006, the Board issued a subpoena to Respondent by regular and certified mail, directing her to appear for an interview on April 6, 2006.

53. The Post Office left Respondent two notices about the certified mail. Respondent never claimed the mail, and it was returned to the Board.

54. The Post Office did not return to the Board the subpoena that had been sent to Respondent by regular mail.

55. On April 18, 2006, the Board investigator left a message on Respondent's cell phone. Respondent did not return the call.

56. On July 21, 2006, the Board investigator left a message on Respondent's cell phone. Respondent did not return the call.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF THE BOARD'S FINDINGS

The above enumerated activities, including but not limited to:

- a. Submitting official "Child Abuse-Report Disposition" reports to DSS on eight (8) families, Cases A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H, that contained fictitious, fabricated and fraudulent information about having interviewed parents, children, school personnel, and a pediatrician regarding alleged child abuse and neglect when, in fact, she had not conducted the interviews;
- b. Wrongfully identifying parents or stepparents as the alleged abuser or neglecter in the Cases of A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H, when subsequent interviews with family members determined that the allegations were unsubstantiated, meaning there was not sufficient evidence to support the allegation, or ruled out, meaning that abuse or neglect did not occur;
- c. Finding that child abuse was indicated in Case A and identifying the father as the alleged abuser based solely on the interview with the mother and without interviewing the father, the allegedly abused child or the allegedly abused child's brother;
- d. Finding that child neglect was indicated in Case B and identifying the stepfather as the alleged neglecter based solely on the report to DSS and without interviewing the stepfather, the mother or the child;
- e. Finding that child abuse was indicated in Case C and identifying the stepfather as the alleged abuser without interviewing the stepfather, mother or the teenager;
- f. Finding that child neglect was ruled out and child abuse was unsubstantiated in Case D and identifying the stepmother as the

alleged abuser without interviewing the stepmother, father, teacher or pediatrician;

- g. Finding that child neglect was unsubstantiated in Case E and identifying the parents as the alleged neglecters without interviewing the parents or the children;
- h. Finding that child abuse was unsubstantiated in Case F and identifying the father as the alleged abuser without interviewing the father, mother or child;
- i. Finding that child neglect was indicated in Case G and identifying the stepmother as the alleged neglecter without interviewing the stepmother, father or child;
- j. Finding that child neglect was unsubstantiated in Case H and identifying the parents as the alleged neglecters, constitute violations of:
 - 1. Commits any act of gross negligence, incompetence, or misconduct in the practice of social work, in violation of § 19-311 (4);
 - 2. Knowingly violates any provision of the Social Work Practice Act, in violation of HO § 19-312(5);
 - 3. Engages in a course of conduct that is inconsistent with generally accepted professional standards in the practice of social work, in violation of § 19-311 (6);
 - 4. Violates any provision of this title or regulations governing the practice of social work adopted and published by the Board, in violation of § 19-311 (7), specifically Code Md. Regs. tit. § 42.03.03 B (1), participating or condoning dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation; and
 - 5. Knowingly makes or files a false report or record in the practice of social work, in violation of HO § 19-311(12).

Respondent's conduct failed to meet her responsibility as a social worker to be honest and truthful in her reporting of client contacts and interviews, and to make professional assessments of child abuse or neglect only after a thorough review of all of the pertinent information, in violation of the Social Work Practice Act.

Respondent's failure to investigate the allegations of abuse and neglect could have resulted in failure to identify an abuser or neglecter, and failure to protect the children from abuse or neglect; and, conversely, could have resulted in wrongfully accusing someone of having neglected or abused a child, or being suspected of having done so, when that did not occur, in violation of the Social Work Practice Act.

Furthermore, the acts described above in Findings of Fact numbers 46 through 56 constitute failure to cooperate with a lawful investigation of the Board in violation of HO § 19-311(17).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Board adopts and incorporates by reference the conclusions made by the ALJ in the Proposed Default Order dated April 11, 2007 wherein the ALJ proposed that the Charges issued by the Board on December 22, 2006 be upheld. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing Findings of Fact and the Proposed Default Order, the Board finds that the Respondent violated H.O. §19-311 (4), (5), (6), (7), (12) and (17) as well as Code Md. Regs. tit. 10 § 42.03.03B(1) (2002).

SANCTION

The Respondent is guilty of serious violations of the Social Work Practice Act and the Board's regulations and Code of Ethics. The Respondent has repeatedly betrayed her employer, her peers and the public trust by her actions. Due to Respondent's complete disregard of her duties and responsibilities as a professional social worker, the Board believes that a severe sanction is necessary to deter such further misconduct by the Respondent and by other social workers who may be tempted

to abdicate their responsibilities to practice social work in an honest and responsible manner.

As the Board's sanctions act as a "catharsis for the profession and a prophylactic for the public," (McDonnell v. Comm'n on Medical Discipline, 301 Md. 426, 436 (1984)), it is imperative that social workers understand that serious misconduct has serious ramifications and is likely to have an effect on one's license to practice one's profession. It is for all of these reasons that the Board has determined to adopt the sanction proposed by the ALJ as the appropriate sanction for such misconduct.

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is this 9th day of June, 2007, by a majority of the full authorized membership of the board, hereby

ORDERED that Maryland social work license of Respondent, Lisa Sharlene Miller, LSWA, license number A04889 is **REVOKED**; and it is further

ORDERED that this Final Decision and Order shall be effective from the date it is signed by the Board; and it is further

ORDERED that this is a Final Order of the Maryland State Board of Social Work Examiners and, as such, is a PUBLIC DOCUMENT and is reportable to any entity to which the Board is obligated by law to report, and is disclosable under the Maryland Public Information Act, Maryland State Gov't Code Ann. §§10-611 et seq.

6-9-07
Date


Wonne M. Perret, LCSW-C Board Chair
Maryland State Board of Social Work
Examiners

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Pursuant to Maryland Health Occ. Code Ann. §19-313, you have a right to take a direct judicial appeal. A petition for appeal shall be filed within thirty (30) days from your receipt of this Final Decision and Order and shall be made as provided for judicial review of a final decision in the Maryland Administrative Procedure Act, Maryland State Gov't Code Ann. §§10-201 et seq., and Title 7, Chapter 200 of the Maryland Rules.