

IN THE MATTER OF
DARNETIA L.WALTON
APPLICANT

* BEFORE THE STATE
* BOARD OF DENTAL EXMINERS
* CASE NUMBER: 2014-242
*

* * * * *

**FINAL ORDER OF DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR DENTAL RADIATION
TECHOLOGIST CERTIFICATION**

The State Board of Dental Examiners (the "Board") notified Darnetia L. Walton ("Applicant") of the Board's intent to deny her Application for Dental Radiation Technologist Certification, under the Maryland Dental Act (the "Act"), Md. Health Occ. Code Ann. I ("H.O.") §§ 4-101*et seq.* (Repl. Vol. 2014). The pertinent provisions state:

Code of Md. Regs tit. 10, §44.19

.03 Qualifications.

A. Except as otherwise provided in these regulations, to qualify to be certified as a dental radiation technologist, an applicant shall be an individual who:

(2) Is of good moral character;

.11 Penalties for Violations of These Regulations.

A. Subject to the hearing provisions of this chapter, the Board may deny a certificate to practice dental radiation technology, reprimand any certified dental radiation technologist, place any certified dental radiation technologist on probation, or suspend or revoke the certificate of any certified dental radiation technologist, if the holder of the certificate:

(7) Is convicted of or pleads guilty or nolo contendere to a felony or a crime involving moral turpitude, whether or not any appeal or other proceeding is pending to have the conviction or plea set aside

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board finds that:

1. On or about March 24, 2014, the Applicant filed an Application for Dental Radiation Technologist Certification ("Application") with the Board.

2. Under the Character and Fitness section of the Application, the Applicant answered "Yes" to the following questions:

f. Have you pled guilty, nolo contendere, had a conviction, or receipt of probation before judgment or other diversionary disposition of any criminal act, excluding minor traffic violations?

g. Have you pled guilty, nolo contendere, had a conviction, or receipt of probation before judgment or other diversionary disposition for an alcohol or controlled dangerous substance offense, including but not limited to driving while under the influence of alcohol or controlled dangerous substances?

3. An investigation conducted by Board staff revealed that the Applicant was convicted of numerous criminal acts, including a conviction for an offense involving driving while under the influence of alcohol.

4. On or about January 31, 2006, the Applicant was found guilty of homicide by motor vehicle while intoxicated, in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Maryland. The Applicant received a five (5) year sentence, with all but six (6) months suspended.

5. The Applicant was also placed on supervised probation for a period of three (3) years. In November 2009, the Applicant was found guilty of violating her probation and was sentenced to one (1) year in jail.

6. On about March 11, 2010, the Applicant was found guilty of possession of counterfeit checks, in violation of Md. Crim. Law Art. § 8-601(b), in the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, Maryland.

7. The Applicant was sentenced to a period of eighteen (18) months, with all but nine (9) months suspended. The Applicant was also placed on supervised probation for a period of three (3) years.

8. On about March 29, 2010, the Applicant was found guilty of counterfeiting checks, in violation of Md. Crim. Law Art. § 8-601(a), in the District Court for Baltimore County, Maryland.

9. The Applicant was sentenced of to a period of eighteen (18) months, with all but nine (9) months suspended. The Applicant was also placed on unsupervised probation for a period of three (3) years.

10. The allegations as set forth in paragraphs 4-9 are grounds for disciplinary action in Maryland and constitute a basis for denial of Applicant's Application under Code of Md. Regs tit. 10, §44.19.11 A (7).

12. The allegations as set forth in paragraphs 4-9 indicate that the Applicant lacks good moral character and constitutes grounds for denial of the Applicant's Application under Code of Md. Regs tit. 10, §44.19.03 A (2).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board concludes that the Applicant lacks good moral character and, therefore, fails to meet the qualifications for licensure under Code of Md. Regs tit. 10, §44.19.03A(2). The Board also concludes that the Applicant's conduct as set forth in the findings of fact, is found to be a violation of Code of Md. Regs tit. 10, §44.19.11A(7).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is this 17th day of July 2015, by a majority of the Board considering this case:

ORDERED that the Application of Darnetia L. Watson is hereby **DENIED**; and it is further

ORDERED that for purposes of public disclosure and as permitted by Md. General Provisions §§ 4-101 *et seq.* (2014), this document consists of the contents of the foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order, and is reportable to any entity to whom the Board is obligated to report; and it is further

ORDERED that this Order is final and a public document pursuant to Md. General Provisions §§ 4-104 *et seq.* (2014).

7/17/15
Date

Ronald F. Moser, D.D.S.
Ronald F. Moser, D.D.S.
President
State Board of Dental Examiners