

BEFORE THE MARYLAND

STATE BOARD OF

PHYSICIANS

Case Number: 2225-0116

* * * * *

CHARGES UNDER THE MARYLAND MEDICAL PRACTICE ACT

Disciplinary Panel A (“Panel A”) of the Maryland State Board of Physicians (the “Board”) hereby charges **PAUL V. BEALS, M.D.** (the “Respondent”), License Number D25922, under the Maryland Medical Practice Act (the “Act”), Md. Code Ann., Health Occupations (“Health Occ.”) §14-401 *et seq.* (2021 Repl. Vol and 2024 Supp.).

Panel A charges the Respondent with violating the following provisions of the Act:

§ 14-404. Denials, reprimands, probations, suspensions, and revocations – Grounds.

- (a) *In general.* Subject to the hearing provisions of § 14-405 of this subtitle, the Board, on the affirmative vote of a majority of the quorum, may reprimand any licensee, place any licensee on probation, or suspend or revoke a license if the licensee:

• • • •

- (4) Is professionally, physically, or mentally incompetent[.]

ALLEGATIONS OF FACT¹

¹ The statements of the Respondent's conduct with respect to the patients identified herein are intended to provide the Respondent with reasonable notice of the alleged charges. They are not intended as, and do not necessarily represent, a complete description of the evidence, either documentary or testimonial, to be offered against the Respondent in connection with this matter.

Panel A bases its charges on the following facts that it has reason to believe are true:

I. Background

1. The Respondent was initially licensed to practice medicine in Maryland on December 19, 1980 under license number D25922. His license is currently active through September 30, 2026, subject to renewal.

2. The Respondent is board-certified in Family Medicine.

3. The Respondent maintains a family medicine practice in Stevensville, Maryland.

II. Respondent's Disciplinary History

1988 Agreement

4. On June 21, 1988, the Board and the Respondent executed a non-public Disposition Agreement and Consent Order (the "1988 Agreement"). The 1988 Agreement required that the Respondent follow certain terms and conditions including limiting the use of non-traditional medical treatments. The Respondent was also prohibited from providing medical or psychiatric services to psychiatric patients and placing advertisements without Board approval. The Board also ordered peer review of the Respondent's medical practice.

1993 Consent Order

5. On October 23, 1991, the Board charged the Respondent with violation of the 1988 Agreement. The Board's charges occurred prior to the Respondent's eligibility to petition for termination of probation pursuant to the 1988 Agreement. A peer review of

twenty-four (24) patients revealed that the Respondent performed inappropriate procedures, provided thyroid medication without diagnostic testing, performed cortisol testing and prescribed steroids without any medical justification, etc. The peer reviewers also noted that the Respondent's medical record documentation and record maintenance was inadequate.

6. On November 10, 1993, the Respondent entered into a Consent Order wherein his license was suspended for three (3) years. The suspension was immediately stayed and he was placed on probation for a period of three (3) years with terms and conditions including, but not limited to, the following: refrain from performing or ordering tests which were not medically indicated and to provide complete disclosure (including Board approved materials) to patients who seek alternative medical treatments. The Consent Order also contained a cease and desist provision, required appropriate documentation in and maintenance of patient medical records, and ongoing periodic peer review.²

1996 Modified Order

7. On July 26, 1996, a Modified Consent Order (the "1996 Order") was executed granting the Respondent's request to perform chelation therapy provided that all patients sign a Board approved consent form.

² On June 5, 1995, the New Jersey State Board of Medical Examiners, in a reciprocal action, suspended the Respondent's medical license for three (3) years.

1999 Modification

8. A December 21, 1998, peer review revealed that the Respondent had inappropriately used FSH testing to assess effectiveness of plant-derived hormone replacement therapy (“HRT”) and that this testing was not within the standards of care for monitoring HRT. In addition, the peer reviewers found that the Respondent overutilized FSH testing on the sixteen (16) patients whose records were reviewed.

9. On October 20, 1999, in lieu of formal charges for the violation, the Respondent entered into a Modification by Consent to the Consent Order (the “1999 Order”). The 1999 Order prohibited the Respondent from performing FSH testing in his office laboratory, required the Respondent to provide a Board-approved disclosure form to all patients for whom he prescribed plant-derived or non-prescription HRT, prohibited the Respondent from using FSH testing to test effectiveness of the HRT, mandated additional peer review or chart review by a Board designee to ascertain FSH testing ordered for patients after the effective date of the order, and probation was to continue pending successful completion of a peer review of the Respondent’s practice.

2004 Consent Order

10. On April 28, 2004, the Respondent entered into a Consent Order with the Board wherein the Board found the Respondent to have violated Health Occupations § 14-404(a)(4) and (18).³ whereby his license to practice medicine in Maryland was

³ Health Occupations §14-404(a)(4) Is professionally, physically, or mentally incompetent, and (18) practices medicine with an unauthorized person or aids an unauthorized person in the practice of medicine.

suspended for a period of two years, followed by probation for a minimum of five years with terms and conditions.⁴

11. On January 4, 2016, the probations imposed under the 1993 and 2004 Orders were terminated.

2013 Consent Order

12. On May 22, 2013, the Respondent entered into a Consent Order wherein the Board concluded as a matter of law that the disciplinary action taken by the District of Columbia Board⁵ against the Respondent was for an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action under Health Occupations § 14-404(a)(3)(ii) and (18)⁶ had those offenses been committed in the State of Maryland.

13. As a result, the Respondent's license was suspended until such time that his license was reinstated by the District of Columbia Board of Medicine (the "DC Board").

14. On February 6, 2014, the DC Board issued a Termination Order which terminated the suspension of the Respondent's license to practice medicine that was imposed by the December 18, 2012 Consent Order.

15. On February 24, 2014, pursuant to the DC Board's Order Termination Order, the Maryland Board terminated the Respondent's suspension.

⁴ On June 26, 2006, pursuant to the 2004 Order, the Respondent's suspension was terminated and he was placed on probation for a period of five (5) years with certain terms and conditions.

⁵ On December 18, 2012, the DC Board of Medicine found the Respondent in violation of D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.14(a)(12)(2001)...willfully practices a health occupation with an unauthorized person or aids an unauthorized person in the practice of medicine as a result of the Respondent permitting and facilitating an unlicensed individual to perform duties well beyond the scope of her medical assistant designation. The Consent Order ordered that the Respondent's license to practice in DC was suspended for a period of one (1) year along with terms and conditions.

⁶ Health Occupations § 14-404(a)(3) Is guilty of: (ii) unprofessional conduct in the practice of medicine and (18) Practices medicine with an unauthorized person or aids an unauthorized person in the practice of medicine.

16. On January 4, 2016, the probations imposed on the Respondent under the 1993 Consent Order and 2004 Consent Order were terminated.

III. The Complaint

17. On December 16, 2024, the Board received a complaint from a patient of the Respondent alleging that the Respondent may have a health condition that affects his ability to practice medicine safely.

18. On January 17, 2025, Board staff conducted an on-site visit at the Respondent's medical office. Board staff noted significant concerns regarding the Respondent's ability to understand the reason for their visit and his current state of mind.

19. Furthermore, family members of the Respondent were present and provided conflicting information regarding the Respondent's current practice. They also shared concerns regarding the Respondent's ability to practice.

20. Based on the information contained in the complaint and information gathered during the on-site visit, on January 22, 2025, the Board sent the Respondent a letter and an email directing the Respondent to appear at the office of the Maryland Professional Rehabilitation Program ("MPRP") on Wednesday, January 29, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. for an intake evaluation for purposes of scheduling an examination.⁷

21. The letter and email also advised the Respondent that pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occupations § 14-402(c), the unreasonable failure or refusal to submit to an examination is *prima facie* evidence of a licensed medical practitioner's inability to

⁷ The Maryland Medical Practice Act (the "Act"), Md. Code Ann., Health Occupations § 14-402(a), authorizes the Board to direct any licensed physician regulated by the Board...to submit to an appropriate evaluation.

practice medicine, unless the Board finds that the failure or refusal was beyond the control of the individual.

22. On January 22, 2025, the Respondent replied to the email notification acknowledging receipt of the communication and asking who to contact at MPRP.

23. On January 27, 2025, the Board again advised the Respondent via email of the requirement to present himself for the intake appointment with MPRP on January 29, 2025.

24. On January 29, 2025, the Respondent informed the Board that he was unable to attend the intake appointment with the Program due to a recent injury. The intake appointment was rescheduled to February 3, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.

25. On February 3, 2025, the Board sent the Respondent an email advising him that he was still required to attend the intake appointment with MPRP at 10:00 a.m.

26. On February 3, 2025, the Respondent failed to appear for the rescheduled appointment.

27. On February 21, 2025, the Board notified the Respondent via email and letter sent via overnight delivery that he had one final opportunity to appear for an appointment with MPRP which was scheduled for February 26, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.

28. The letter and email, again, notified the Respondent that pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occupations § 14-402(c), the unreasonable failure or refusal to submit to an examination is *prima facie* evidence of a licensed medical practitioner's inability to practice medicine, unless the Board finds that the failure or refusal was beyond the control of the individual.

29. The Respondent did not appear for the appointment on February 26, 202, and did not notify the Board or MPRP of any reason that he was unable to appear.

IV. Grounds for Discipline

The Respondent's actions, as described above, constitute, in whole or in part, being professionally, physically, or mentally incompetent in violation of Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4).

NOTICE OF POSSIBLE SANCTIONS

If, after a hearing, a disciplinary panel of the Board finds that there are grounds for action under Health Occ. §§ 14-404(a)(4), it may impose disciplinary sanctions against the Respondent's license in accordance with the Board's regulations under Md. Code Regs. 10.32.02.09 and 10.32.02.10, including revocation, suspension, reprimand, and may place the Respondent on probation. The panel may, in addition to one or more of the sanctions set forth above, impose a civil monetary fine upon the Respondent.

NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE FOR CASE RESOLUTION CONFERENCE, PREHEARING CONFERENCE AND HEARING


A Disciplinary Committee for Case Resolution ("DCCR") Conference in this matter is scheduled for Wednesday, May 14, 2025, at the Board's office, 4201 Patterson Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland 21215. The nature and purpose of the DCCR is described in a letter sent to the Respondent. The Respondent must confirm in writing his intent to attend the DCCR. The Respondent should send written confirmation of his intent to participate in the DCCR to:

Christine A. Farrelly
Executive Director
Maryland Board of Physicians
4201 Patterson Avenue, 4th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

If the case cannot be resolved at the DCCR, a pre-hearing conference and a hearing in this matter will be scheduled at the Office of Administrative Hearings, 11101 Gilroy Road, Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031. The hearing will be conducted in accordance with Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 14-405 and Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 et seq. (2022 Repl. Vol.).

ANTHONY G. BROWN
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND

3/4/2025
Date


JoAnna M. Miller, Assistant Attorney General
Administrative Prosecutors
Maryland Office of the Attorney General
Health Occupations Prosecution & Litigation Div.
300 West Preston Street, Suite 201
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Direct: (410) 767-3448