

<p>IN THE MATTER OF</p> <p>HEATHER D. BEEMAN, LGPC</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Respondent</p> <p>License Number:</p> <p>LGP7199</p>	<p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p>	<p>BEFORE THE</p> <p>STATE BOARD OF</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS</p> <p>AND THERAPISTS</p> <p>Case Number: 2016-50 & 2017-07</p>
---	--	---

* * * * *

ORDER OF REVOCATION OF LICENSE TO PRACTICE AS A LICENSED GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL COUNSELOR

On March 23, 2018, the Maryland State Board of Professional Counselors (the "Board") notified **HEATHER D. BEEMAN, LGPC** (the "Respondent"), **license number LGP7199**, of the Board's intent to **REVOKE** her license to practice as a Licensed Graduate Professional Counselor pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 *et seq.* (2014 Repl. Vol. & 2017 Supp.) and the Maryland State Board of Professional Counselors and Therapists Act (the "Act"), Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. ("Health Occ.") §§ 17-101 *et seq.* (2014 Repl. Vol. & 2017 Supp.).

The pertinent provisions of the APA state:

§ 10-226. Licenses – Special Provisions.

...

(c) *Revocation or suspension.* -- (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, a unit may not revoke or suspend a license unless the unit first gives the licensee:

- (i) written notice of the facts that warrant suspension or revocation; and
- (ii) an opportunity to be heard.

Specifically, the Board intends to revoke the Respondent's license to practice as an LGPC based upon the following provisions under Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 17-509:

Denial, probation, suspension or revocation of certificate applicant or holder.

Subject to the hearing provisions of § 17-511 of this subtitle, the Board, on the affirmative vote of a majority of its members then serving, may deny a license or certificate to any applicant, place any licensee or certificate holder on probation, reprimand any licensee or certificate holder, or suspend or revoke a license of any licensee or a certificate of any certificate holder if the applicant, licensee, or certificate holder:

- ...
- (8) Violates the code of ethics adopted by the Board;
- (9) Knowingly violates any provision of this title;
- ...
- (13) Violates any rule or regulation adopted by the Board;
- ...
- (16) Commits an act of immoral or unprofessional conduct in the practice of clinical or nonclinical counseling or therapy[.]

The pertinent regulations under Md. Code Regs. 10.58.03 Code of Ethics, are as follows:

.02 Definitions

...

B. Terms defined.

(4) "Dual relationship" means a relationship in which a counselor is simultaneously involved in more than one type of relationship with a client.

...

(6) "Inappropriate sexual language" means:

- ...
- (b) An eroticized or sexually provocative comment not reasonably associated with a health care matter;
- (c) An inappropriate discussion of a sexually related matter.

.04 Ethical Responsibility.

A. A counselor shall:

...

(11) Be familiar with and adhere to this chapter;

...

(14) Take reasonable precautions to protect clients from physical or psychological trauma[.]

B. A counselor may not:

...

(3) Enter into relationships that could compromise a counselor's objectivity or create a conflict of interest[.]

.05 The Counseling Relationship.

A. Client Welfare and Rights.

...

(2) A counselor may not:

(a) Place or participate in placing clients in positions that may result in damaging the interests and the welfare of clients, employees, employers, or the public[.]

B. Dual relationships

(1) A counselor shall:

(a) Avoid dual relationships with clients; and

(b) Take appropriate measures, including but not limited to, informed consent, consultation, supervision, and documentation to ensure that judgment is not impaired and no exploitation occurs if a dual relationship cannot be avoided.

...

.09 Sexual Misconduct.

A. A counselor may not engage in sexual misconduct with a client or supervisee. Sexual misconduct includes but is not limited to:

(1) Inappropriate sexual language;

...

(4) Sexual behavior;

...

C. Relationship with Former Clients.

(1) Except as set forth in § C(3) of this regulation, a counselor may not engage in sexual behavior with a former client.

(2) A counselor may not terminate professional services or a professional relationship with a client in order to enter into a nonprofessional, social, or sexual relationship with a client...

(3) A counselor may enter into a relationship with an individual with whom a counselor's prior professional contact was brief, peripheral, consultative, or indirect, and did not constitute a therapeutic relationship.

The Respondent was informed that an Order of Revocation of License to practice as a Licensed Graduate Professional Counselor would be executed **THIRTY (30) DAYS** from date of receipt of the Board's notice, unless the Respondent requested a hearing.

In order for the Board not to execute this Final Order, a written request for a hearing had to be received from the Respondent. The Respondent withdrew her request for a hearing..

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board finds:

1. On or about July 6, 2016, the Respondent was initially licensed by the Board as an LGPC. The Respondent's license is scheduled for renewal on July 31, 2018.

Case# 2016-50

2. From approximately February 2013 through September 2016, the Respondent was employed as a graduate student/intern in counseling by Practice A¹ located in Cumberland, Maryland, and was supervised by Counselor A.

¹ In order to maintain confidentiality, facility, patient and employee names will not be used in this document but will be provided to the Respondent on request.

3. On or about September 21, 2016, Counselor A filed a complaint with the Board alleging the Respondent had displayed boundary issues, a lack of professionalism, and an impaired job performance.

4. Based on the complaint filed by Counselor A, the Board initiated an investigation of the allegations which included an interview of Counselor A.

Case# 2017-07

5. From approximately September 2016 through February 9, 2017, the Respondent was employed by Practice B, a practice located in Cumberland, Maryland, as an LGPC. Practice B terminated the Respondent's employment for reasons set forth below.

6. On or about February 13, 2017, Client A, a former male client of the Respondent, filed a complaint with the Board through his attorney, alleging the Respondent had engaged in a sexual relationship with him in January 2017, asked Client A for money (unrelated to professional services rendered), and asked him to rob people outside of a casino located near Cumberland.

7. On or about March 15, 2017, a social worker filed a complaint against the Respondent alleging that the Respondent had inappropriately posted client information on a social media site.

8. In furtherance of its investigation, Board staff interviewed the Respondent, Client A, subpoenaed Client A's employment records from Practice A and Practice B, obtained multiple text messages and photographs allegedly communicated between the Respondent and Client A, and subpoenaed Client A's records from Practice B.

9. The Respondent acknowledged through a written statement and during her interview with Board staff that she had engaged in boundary violations with Client A.

CLIENT A

10. On or about November 4, 2016, the Respondent began seeing Client A for marital problems and anger issues. The Respondent documented nine therapy visits with Client A through January 5, 2017.

11. On January 5, 2017, the Respondent documented that she and Client A had “discussed” terminating their therapeutic relationship due to a “conflict of interest” with children and family relations. The Respondent also referred to the relationship with Client A as a “dual relationship.” She documented that she had provided to Client A the contact information for a new therapist.

12. On or about February 7, 2017, the Human Resources (“HR”) Director for Practice B interviewed the Respondent regarding her relationship with Client A. The HR director typed a statement of her meeting with the Respondent.

13. According to the HR Director’s statement, the Respondent ended her relationship with Client A on February 3, 2017. The Respondent did not admit to the HR Director that she had engaged in sexual activity with Client A.

14. Effective February 9, 2017, Practice B terminated the Respondent’s employment because of her relationship with Client A, finding her to have engaged in an “ethics violation.”

Respondent’s Interview

15. On or about May 16, 2017, Board staff conducted an in-person interview of the Respondent under oath.

16. The Respondent stated that after approximately five visits with Client A, a mutual attraction developed. The Respondent referred to this mutual attraction as a “conflict of interest.”

17. The Respondent stated that she made several unsuccessful attempts to speak with Counselor B, a co-worker, about the mutual attraction, but for various reasons Counselor B was unable to meet with the Respondent regarding Client A.

18. The Respondent acknowledged that she dated Client A, but stated it was after terminating her counselor-client relationship with him. She stated that she acted on her feelings for Client A because she thought he would treat her like a “woman should be treated.”

19. The Respondent stated that she had a sexual relationship with Client A that lasted approximately three weeks.

20. The Respondent stated that she gambled with Client A but said it was “after” he was her client.

21. The Respondent acknowledged that she sent nude pictures of herself to Client A but stated it was “after” he was her client. She stated that Client A had sent nude pictures of himself to her and she was reciprocating.

22. On or about February 7, 2017, the Respondent discovered that Client A and his wife had posted derogatory information about the Respondent on a social media site and she responded to the allegations on the site.

23. When asked by Board staff why she had engaged in the above-described conduct, the Respondent stated that she was “sick.” She admitted to a condition that impairs her ability to practice competently.

Interview with Client A

24. On or about May 17, 2017, Board staff interviewed Client A under oath regarding the allegations in his complaint.
25. Client A stated that he began seeing the Respondent for marital counseling after his wife left him in September 2016.
26. Client A stated that the Respondent discussed her personal issues during the sessions and discussed two other clients she had been counseling.
27. On or about January 5, 2017, Client A and the Respondent went out for a beer, gambling and Client A stayed the night at the Respondent's residence.
28. Client A estimated that he and the Respondent had engaged in sexual relations on 50 occasions over the course of one month.
29. Client A stated that he and the Respondent texted and some of the conversations he characterized as "dirty."
30. Client A confirmed that the Respondent had sent him nude photos of herself.
31. In mid-January, Client A and the Respondent went to a casino near Cumberland, Maryland, and the Respondent spent her entire paycheck in one poker machine. According to Client A, the Respondent asked him to "rob people" coming out of the casino.
32. The Respondent contacted Client A's wife by telephone in response to a social media posting that Client A's wife had purportedly posted and left the following message on her voice mail: "...I am not a slut. I am a b----, not a whore, and I am a friend of his, so have a nice day..."

Case# 2018-77

33. On or about April 25, 2018, a Human Resources Manager for a comprehensive behavioral health provider located in West Virginia ("Practice C") filed a complaint with the Board alleging that the Respondent had engaged in extensive boundary violations with a former client ("Client B") who had to be hospitalized purportedly as a result of the encounter with the Respondent.

CLIENT B

34. The Respondent was employed by Practice C from May 8, 2017, through February 16, 2018.

35. On or about March 5, 2018, Client B² reported to Practice C that she had recently been discharged from a voluntary hospitalization, and her former therapist, the Respondent, had engaged in professional and ethical boundary violations. Specifically, Client B reported the following to Practice C:

- The Respondent had shared with Client B that she had a similar mental health diagnosis;
- The Respondent drove Client B in her personal vehicle, had alcohol in the vehicle and told Client B to 'make a drink';
- The Respondent drove Client B and herself to a bar where the Respondent gambled, and Client B became intoxicated;
- The Respondent asked Client B for money, drove Client B to an ATM and became angry with Client B when she did not have adequate funds in her account;
- Client B spent the night at the Respondent's residence and Client B's spouse picked her up the following morning; and
- Client B was hospitalized for one week following this occurrence as she reported feeling guilt, shame and depression.

² Client B informed Board staff that she was not willing to be interviewed as she feared retaliation from the Respondent, and that the process would cause Client B "stress."

36. The Board notified the Respondent of the complaint filed by the Human Resources Manager employed by Practice C and requested a written response to the allegations referenced in ¶ 33.

37. On or about May 11, 2018, the Respondent filed a written response with the Board. The Respondent stated that she had been working in West Virginia as a counselor without the appropriate credentials. The Respondent acknowledged that she brought Client B to her residence after a night of drinking, gambling, and an altercation between Client B and a liquor store owner that resulted in police presence. Client B slept at the Respondent's residence. The Respondent was aware that Client B's husband had Client B hospitalized following the incident.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board concludes as a matter of law that the Respondent's conduct, in whole or in in part, constitutes violations of the code of ethics adopted by the Board in violation of Health Occ. § 17-509(8), specifically under Md. Code Regs. 10.58.03.02 *et seq.*; a knowing violation of any provision of this title in violation of Health Occ. § 17-509(9); violations of regulations of the Board in violation of Health Occ. § 17-509(13), specifically under Md. Code Regs. 10.58.03.02 *et seq.*, .04 *et seq.*, .05 *et seq.* and 09 *et seq.*; and immoral or unprofessional conduct in the practice of clinical or nonclinical counseling or therapy in violation of Health Occ. § 17-509(16).

ORDER

Based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law, it is, by a majority of the Board's members then serving:

ORDERED that the license of Heather D. Beeman to practice as a Licensed Graduate Professional Counselor in the State of Maryland be and is hereby **REVOKED**; and it is further

ORDERED that this Final Order is a public document pursuant to Md. Code Ann, Gen. Prov. §§ 4-101 et seq. (2014 & 2016 Supp.).

12/21/18
Date



Risa Ganel, LCMFT, Chair
Maryland State Board of Professional
Counselors and Therapists

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 17-512(b), the Respondent has the right to take a direct judicial appeal. Any appeal shall be filed within 30 days from the receipt of this Final Order and shall be made as provided for judicial review of a final decision in the Maryland Administrative Procedure Act, State Gov't Article § 10-222 and Title 7, Chapter 200 of the Maryland Rules of Procedure.

If the Respondent files an appeal, the Board is a party and should be served with the court's process. In addition, the Respondent should send a copy to the Board's counsel, Rhonda Edwards, Assistant Attorney General, at the Office of the Attorney General, 300 West Preston Street, Suite 302, Baltimore, Maryland 21201. The Administrative Prosecutor is not involved in the circuit court process and need not be served or copied on pleadings filed in that court.



MARYLAND Department of Health

Larry Hogan, Governor – Boyd Rutherford, Lt. Governor – Robert R. Neall, Secretary

BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS AND THERAPISTS

4201 Patterson Ave, Suite 316, Baltimore, Maryland 21215-2299

May 18, 2018

Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested
7014 0150 0000 0251 8653 and Regular Mail

Heather D. Beeman, LGPC
15117 Trail Ridge Road, S.W.
Cumberland, Maryland 21502

Re: **NOTICE OF SUMMARY SUSPENSION**
License Number: LGP7199
Case Numbers: 2016-50, 2017-07 & 2018-77

Dear Ms. Beeman:

Enclosed please find an Order for Summary Suspension (the "Order") of your license to practice as a licensed graduate professional counselor in the State of Maryland, issued pursuant to the State Government Article § 10-226(c)(2) of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

Please be advised that the Maryland State Board of Professional Counselors and Therapists (the "Board") is summarily suspending your license to practice licensed graduate professional counseling in the State of Maryland. You are directed to immediately **SURRENDER** your clinical professional counselor's license, wallet card and wall certificate to the Board's Executive Director, Kimberly Link, or her designee at the address below.

You have the opportunity to appear before the Board or for a post-deprivation show cause hearing (the "Show Cause Hearing"). This limited appearance is intended to provide you with an opportunity to show cause why the Board should not continue the suspension of your license. Your request for a Show Cause Hearing must be **IN WRITING** and be made **WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS** of service of this Order. The written request must be made to:

Kimberly Link, Executive Director
Maryland State Board of Professional Counselors & Therapists
4201 Patterson Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

with copies mailed to:

Dawn L. Rubin, Assistant Attorney General
Administrative Prosecutor

Maryland Office of the Attorney General
Health Occupations Prosecution and Litigation Division
300 West Preston Street, Suite 201
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

If a written request for a Show Cause Hearing is made, a Show Cause Hearing will be scheduled at the Board's offices at 4201 Patterson Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland, 21215.

At the conclusion of the Show Cause Hearing before the Board, if you are dissatisfied with the result of the hearing, you may make a written request for an evidentiary hearing. If you request an evidentiary hearing in writing, the Board will schedule an evidentiary hearing and the hearing will be conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-201 *et seq.* (2014 Repl. Vol. & 2017 Supp.).

If you do not request a Show Cause Hearing, or if your request is not made in writing and within 30 days of service of this Order, the Board will not schedule a Show Cause Hearing and your license will remain suspended.

Because your right to practice clinical professional counseling in the State of Maryland is at issue, **you are strongly urged to retain and be represented by an attorney at all stages of this proceeding.** If you choose to retain counsel, please be advised that in order to represent you at any proceedings in this case, your attorney must be either admitted to the Maryland bar or specially admitted to practice law in Maryland under Rule 19-214 of the rules governing admission to the bar found in Volume II of the Maryland Rules.

The administrative prosecutor in this case is Dawn L. Rubin, Assistant Attorney General. If you have questions about the summary suspension or your appearance before the Board, please contact Ms. Rubin at (410) 767-1874.

Sincerely,



Risa Ganel, LCMFT
Board Chair
Maryland State Board of Professional
Counselors & Therapists

Enclosure

cc: Gorman E. Getty, III, Esquire
Kimberly Link, J.D., Executive Director
Nicholas Johansson, Principal Counsel, HOPL
Rhonda Edwards, Assistant Attorney General, Board Counsel
Dawn L. Rubin, Assistant Attorney General, Administrative Prosecutor
Larry Schuyler, Health Occupations Investigator III
Rosalind Spellman, Administrative Officer
Gloria Brown, Administrative Officer

IN THE MATTER OF	*	BEFORE THE
HEATHER BEEMAN, LGPC	*	STATE BOARD OF
Respondent	*	PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS
License Number:	*	AND THERAPISTS
LGP7199	*	Case Number: 2016-50, 2017-07 & 2018-77

* * * * *

**ORDER FOR SUMMARY SUSPENSION
OF LICENSE TO PRACTICE LICENSED GRADUATE
PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING**

The Maryland State Board of Professional Counselors and Therapists (the “Board”), hereby **SUMMARILY SUSPENDS** the license of Heather Beeman, LGPC (the “Respondent”) License Number LGP7199, to practice licensed graduate professional counseling in the State of Maryland. The Board takes such action pursuant to its authority under Md. Code Ann., State Gov’t § 10-226(c)(2)(i) (2014 Repl. Vol. & 2017 Supp.), concluding that the public health, safety or welfare imperatively requires emergency action.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS

Based on information received by, and made known to the Board, and the investigatory information obtained by, received by and made known to and available to the Board, including the instances described below, the Board has reason to believe that the following facts are true:¹

¹ The statements regarding the Respondent’s conduct are intended to provide the Respondent with notice of the basis of the suspension. 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 this matter.

1. On or about July 6, 2016, the Respondent was initially licensed by the Board as an LGPC. The Respondent's license is scheduled for renewal on July 31, 2018.

Case# 2016-50

2. From approximately February 2013 through September 2016, the Respondent was employed as a graduate student/intern in counseling by Practice A² located in Cumberland, Maryland, and was supervised by Counselor A.

3. On or about September 21, 2016, Counselor A filed a complaint with the Board alleging the Respondent had displayed boundary issues, a lack of professionalism, and an impaired job performance.

4. Based on the complaint filed by Counselor A, the Board initiated an investigation of the allegations which included an interview of Counselor A.

Case# 2017-07

5. From approximately September 2016 through February 9, 2017, the Respondent was employed by Practice B, a practice located in Cumberland, Maryland, as an LGPC. Practice B terminated the Respondent's employment for reasons set forth below.

6. On or about February 13, 2017, Client A, a former male client of the Respondent, filed a complaint with the Board through his attorney, alleging the Respondent had engaged in a sexual relationship with him in January 2017, asked Client A for money (unrelated to professional services rendered), and asked him to rob people outside of a casino located near Cumberland.

² In order to maintain confidentiality, facility, patient and employee names will not be used in this document but will be provided to the Respondent on request.

7. On or about March 15, 2017, a social worker filed a complaint against the Respondent alleging that the Respondent had inappropriately posted client information on a social media site.

8. In furtherance of its investigation, Board staff interviewed the Respondent, Client A, subpoenaed Client A's employment records from Practice A and Practice B, obtained multiple text messages and photographs allegedly communicated between the Respondent and Client A, and subpoenaed Client A's records from Practice B.

9. The Respondent acknowledged through a written statement and during her interview with Board staff that she had engaged in boundary violations with Client A.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS

CLIENT A

10. On or about November 4, 2016, the Respondent began seeing Client A for marital problems and anger issues. The Respondent documented nine therapy visits with Client A through January 5, 2017.

11. On January 5, 2017, the Respondent documented that she and Client A had "discussed" terminating their therapeutic relationship due to a "conflict of interest" with children and family relations. The Respondent also referred to the relationship with Client A as a "dual relationship." She documented that she had provided to Client A the contact information for a new therapist.

12. On or about February 7, 2017, the Human Resources ("HR") Director for Practice B interviewed the Respondent regarding her relationship with Client A. The HR director typed a statement of her meeting with the Respondent.

13. According to the HR Director's statement, the Respondent ended her relationship with Client A on February 3, 2017. The Respondent did not admit to the HR Director that she had engaged in sexual activity with Client A.

14. Effective February 9, 2017, Practice B terminated the Respondent's employment because of her relationship with Client A, finding her to have engaged in an "ethics violation."

Respondent's Interview

15. On or about May 16, 2017, Board staff conducted an in-person interview of the Respondent under oath.

16. The Respondent stated that after approximately five visits with Client A, a mutual attraction developed. The Respondent referred to this mutual attraction as a "conflict of interest."

17. The Respondent stated that she made several unsuccessful attempts to speak with Counselor B, a co-worker, about the mutual attraction, but for various reasons Counselor B was unable to meet with the Respondent regarding Client A.

18. The Respondent acknowledged that she dated Client A, but stated it was after terminating her counselor-client relationship with him. She stated that she acted on her feelings for Client A because she thought he would treat her like a "woman should be treated."

19. The Respondent stated that she had a sexual relationship with Client A that lasted approximately three weeks.

20. The Respondent stated that she gambled with Client A but said it was "after" he was her client.

21. The Respondent acknowledged that she sent nude pictures of herself to Client A but stated it was “after” he was her client. She stated that Client A had sent nude pictures of himself to her and she was reciprocating.

22. On or about February 7, 2017, the Respondent discovered that Client A and his wife had posted derogatory information about the Respondent on a social media site and she responded to the allegations on the site.

23. When asked by Board staff why she had engaged in the above-described conduct, the Respondent stated that she was “sick.” She admitted to a condition that impairs her ability to practice competently.

Interview with Client A

24. On or about May 17, 2017, Board staff interviewed Client A under oath regarding the allegations in his complaint.

25. Client A stated that he began seeing the Respondent for marital counseling after his wife left him in September 2016.

26. Client A stated that the Respondent discussed her personal issues during the sessions and discussed two other clients she had been counseling.

27. On or about January 5, 2017, Client A and the Respondent went out for a beer, gambling and Client A stayed the night at the Respondent’s residence.

28. Client A estimated that he and the Respondent had engaged in sexual relations on 50 occasions over the course of one month.

29. Client A stated that he and the Respondent texted and some of the conversations he characterized as “dirty.”

30. Client A confirmed that the Respondent had sent him nude photos of herself.

31. In mid-January, Client A and the Respondent went to a casino near Cumberland, Maryland, and the Respondent spent her entire paycheck in one poker machine. According to Client A, the Respondent asked him to “rob people” coming out of the casino.

32. The Respondent contacted Client A’s wife by telephone in response to a social media posting that Client A’s wife had purportedly posted and left the following message on her voice mail: “...I am not a slut. I am a b----, not a whore, and I am a friend of his, so have a nice day...”

Case# 2018-77

33. On or about April 25, 2018, a Human Resources Manager for a comprehensive behavioral health provider located in West Virginia (“Practice C”) filed a complaint with the Board alleging that the Respondent had engaged in extensive boundary violations with a former client (“Client B”) who had to be hospitalized purportedly as a result of the encounter with the Respondent.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS

CLIENT B

34. The Respondent was employed by Practice C from May 8, 2017, through February 16, 2018.

35. On or about March 5, 2018, Client B³ reported to Practice C that she had recently been discharged from a voluntary hospitalization, and her former therapist, the

³ Client B informed Board staff that she was not willing to be interviewed as she feared retaliation from the Respondent, and that the process would cause Client B “stress.”

Respondent, had engaged in professional and ethical boundary violations. Specifically, Client B reported the following to Practice C:

- The Respondent had shared with Client B that she had a similar mental health diagnosis;
- The Respondent drove Client B in her personal vehicle, had alcohol in the vehicle and told Client B to 'make a drink';
- The Respondent drove Client B and herself to a bar where the Respondent gambled, and Client B became intoxicated;
- The Respondent asked Client B for money, drove Client B to an ATM and became angry with Client B when she did not have adequate funds in her account;
- Client B spent the night at the Respondent's residence and Client B's spouse picked her up the following morning; and
- Client B was hospitalized for one week following this occurrence as she reported feeling guilt, shame and depression.

36. The Board notified the Respondent of the complaint filed by the Human Resources Manager employed by Practice C and requested a written response to the allegations referenced in ¶ 33.

37. On or about May 11, 2018, the Respondent filed a written response with the Board. The Respondent stated that she had been working in West Virginia as a counselor without the appropriate credentials. The Respondent acknowledged that she brought Client B to her residence after a night of drinking, gambling, and an altercation between Client B and a liquor store owner that resulted in police presence. Client B slept at the Respondent's residence. The Respondent was aware that Client B's husband had Client B hospitalized following the incident.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Based on the foregoing facts, the Board concludes that the public health, safety or welfare imperatively require emergency action in this case, pursuant to Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-226 (c)(2)(i) (2009 Repl. vol. & 2017 Supp.).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, it is by a majority of the Board considering this case:

ORDERED that pursuant to the authority vested by Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-226(c)(2), the Respondent's license to practice graduate professional counseling in the State of Maryland be and is hereby **SUMMARILY SUSPENDED**; and be it further

ORDERED that the Respondent has the opportunity to appear before the Board for a post-deprivation show cause hearing. A request for a post-deprivation show cause hearing must be in writing and be made **WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS** of service of this Order. The written request should be made to:

Kimberly Link, J.D., Executive Director
Maryland State Board of Professional Counselors & Therapists
4201 Patterson Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Please copy:

Dawn L. Rubin, Assistant Attorney General
Maryland Office of the Attorney General
Health Occupations Prosecution & Litigation Division
300 West Preston Street, Suite 201
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

and

Rhonda Edwards, Assistant Attorney General
Maryland Office of the Attorney General
300 West Preston Street, Suite 302
Baltimore, Maryland 21201; and it is further

ORDERED that if the Respondent fails to request a post-deprivation show cause hearing in writing, or if the Respondent requests a post-deprivation show cause hearing but fails to appear when scheduled, the Respondent's license will remain **SUSPENDED**; and it is further

ORDERED that on presentation of this Order, the Respondent **SHALL SURRENDER** to the Board, the following items:

- (1) the Respondent's original Maryland License **LGP7199**;
- (2) the Respondent's wallet card and wall certificate; and it is further

ORDERED that this is a Final Order of the Board and, as such, is a **PUBLIC DOCUMENT** pursuant to Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-611 *et seq.*

5/18/18
Date

Risa Ganel
Risa Ganel, LCMFT, Chair
Maryland State Board of Professional
Counselors and Therapists