

IN THE MATTER OF

*

BEFORE THE

AECHA OLIVARRIA, LMT

*

MARYLAND STATE BOARD

Respondent

*

CHIROPRACTIC & MASSAGE

*

THERAPY EXAMINERS

License Number: M01385

*

Case Number: 2009-10M

* * * * *

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

BACKGROUND

On August 26, 2009, the Maryland State Board of Chiropractic and Massage Therapy Examiners (the "Board") issued charges against Aecha Olivarria ("Ms. Olivarria" or the "Respondent"), Licensed Massage Therapist ("L.M.T."), (D.O.B. 07/31/75), License Number M01385. The Board issued the charges in accordance with the Maryland Chiropractic Act (the "Act"), Md. Health Occ. Code Ann. ("H.O.") §§ 3-101 *et seq.* (2005 Repl. Vol. and 2008 Supp.) and Code Md. Regs. ("COMAR") tit. 10, §§ 43.18 *et seq.* (effective October 1, 2008). On February 12, 2009, Ms. Olivarria and two other licensed massage therapists were arrested at Grandview Therapy in Wheaton, Maryland. Ms. Olivarria and the two other therapists were all arrested at the same place and time. All three were later charged with prostitution. Because the facts of the charges against the Respondents generally related to the same incident the Board held one hearing for all three licensees. All three licensees were represented by the same

counsel throughout the proceeding. For her part in the matter, Ms. Olivarria was charged with numerous violations of the Board's practice act and regulations.

The pertinent provisions of the Act under H.O. § 3-5A-11 provide the following:

(a) *Denial of license or registration.* -- Subject to the hearing provisions of § 3-315 of this subtitle, the Board may ... reprimand any licensee ..., place any licensee ... on probation, or suspend or revoke the license of a licensee ... if the ... licensee ...:

(2) Fraudulently or deceptively uses a license or registration;

(8) Does an act that is inconsistent with generally accepted professional standards in the practice of massage therapy;

(19) Fails to cooperate with a lawful investigation conducted by the Board;

(20) Engages in conduct that violates the professional code of ethics;
[and/or]

(21) Knowingly does an act that has been determined by the Board to be a violation of the Board's regulations.

In addition, the Board alleges that the Respondent violated one or more of the following COMAR regulations:

COMAR 10.43.18 MASSAGE THERAPY CODE OF ETHICS COMAR 10.43.18.02
Definitions.

B. Terms Defined.

(2) "Non bona fide treatment" means when a certificate holder or registration holder treats or examines a client in a way that involves sexual contact, but there is no therapeutic reason for the procedure, or the procedure falls outside of reasonable massage therapy or non-therapeutic massage practices.

COMAR 10.43.18.03 Standards of Practice.

C. A certificate holder or registration holder shall:

- (2) Engage in professional conduct at all times, with honesty, integrity, self-respect, and fairness;
- (3) Remain free from conflict of interest while fulfilling the objectives and maintaining the integrity of the massage therapy profession;
- (6) Practice massage therapy or non-therapeutic massage only as defined in the scope of practice set out in Health Occupations Article, § 3-5A-01, Annotated Code of Maryland;
- (7) Cooperate with a lawful investigation conducted by the Board of Chiropractic Examiners, including:
 - (a) Furnishing information requested,
 - (b) Complying with a subpoena,
 - (c) Responding to a complaint at the request of the Board, and
 - (d) Providing meaningful and timely access to relevant client records.

D. A certificate holder or registration holder may not:

(2) Knowingly engage in or condone behavior that:

(a) Is fraudulent,

(b) Is dishonest,

(c) Is deceitful, or

(d) Involves moral turpitude.

COMAR 10.43.18.04 Relationship with Client.

A. A certificate holder or registration holder shall:

(4) Maintain legible, organized written records of treatment of any client under the care of the certificate holder or registration holder for at least 5 years after termination of treatment and as provided by applicable provisions of Health-General Article, Title 4, Subtitle 3, Annotated Code of Maryland.

COMAR 10.43.18.05 Professional Boundaries.

A. A certificate holder or registration holder shall:

(1) Maintain professional boundaries, even when the client initiates crossing professional boundaries of the professional relationship;

B. A certificate holder or registration holder may not:

Engage in a sexually intimate act with a client; or

Engage in sexual misconduct that includes, but is not limited to:

(b) Non bona fide treatment, or

(c) A sexually exploitative relationship.

Initially, an evidentiary hearing on the merits of the case was held on April 29, 2010. On that day, the hearing was not completed and the matter was continued. On September 23, 2010, before a quorum of the Board, the matter was heard in full. The hearings were conducted pursuant to H.O. § 3-315(a). Preliminarily, Ms. Olivarria moved to recuse the Board's counsel and prosecutor because she was not provided with notice of their participation in the hearing. This motion was denied. Ms. Olivarria moved to have the matter continued and rescheduled as a motions hearing at a future date. This motion was denied. Ms. Olivarria moved to recuse the Board members who had participated in the Case Resolution Conference on this matter. That motion was also denied. Ms. Olivarria moved to have three separate hearings held on this matter. The Board opted to deny the motion and hold a joint hearing.

Ms. Olivarria subpoenaed personnel information and any public discipline relating to Montgomery County Police Detective Stack. Montgomery County intervened and moved to quash this subpoena. Montgomery County also requested a protective order. William Snoddy, Assistant County Attorney for Montgomery County appeared and proffered that there were no public orders regarding Detective Stack. The Board granted the motion to quash the subpoena for Detective Stack's personnel file.

Numerous objections to admissibility and weight of exhibits and testimony were made during the hearing. The Board issues this order in accordance with its rulings during the hearing. The Board issues this Final Decision and Order based upon its consideration of the entire record, including the exhibits, witness testimony and oral arguments. For the reasons set forth below, the Board approves and adopts this Final Decision and Order.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

The State entered exhibits 1a-k, 2a-k, 3a-l, 4a-j, 5 and 6 into evidence. Detective Thomas Stack and Investigator Marc Ware testified on behalf of the State. Ms. Olivarria did not appear or testify on her own behalf. Ms. Olivarria was represented by counsel throughout the proceeding. Ms. Snyder testified on her own behalf. Ms. Olivarria entered exhibits 1 – 5 in to evidence.¹

Detective Stack

Detective Stack has been a member of the Montgomery County Police Department since 1988. And for the past nine years, Detective Stack has served as a member of the department's vice section. Detective Stack has a great deal of experience in investigating vice and prostitution-related activities. The Board found his testimony to be quite credible.

Detective Stack began investigating Grandview Therapy early 2009 after looking at a web posting that was placed in a Montgomery County subsection of an internet

¹. Ms. Snyder provided a print out of the USA Sex guide forum that mentioned one of the prosecuting attorneys in this case. The Board found that this print out was not relevant and was given no weight.

website entitled, the USA Sex Guide Forum. The site advertises that its purpose is to facilitate the exchange of information between men who are looking for sex with women. In particular, individuals regularly post information about the services they received from prostitutes in massage parlors. A printout of the website was admitted into evidence.

On or about January the 31st, 2009, Detective Stack testified that he read a posting in the forum about Grandview Therapy in Wheaton, Maryland. A post described going in for a massage and receiving sexual services in exchange for money. Detective Stack's used his training and experience, to recognize that this web post was about obtaining sexual services from prostitutes.

Detective Stack stated that he set up a surveillance operation at Grandview in late January and February 2009. On two separate occasions he intercepted men who were coming out of Grandview Therapy and interviewed them about the treatment they had received at Grandview Therapy. Both stated that they had learned about Grandview from an advertisement that was placed in the Washington Post. Detective Stack stated that he knew that the sports pages were often a place where prostitution-related activities were often advertised but in the guise of massage therapy centers. Both of these individuals that Detective Stack interviewed described largely the same scenario. Each went into Grandview Therapy and paid a sum of money for massage. Each received massages from an Asian woman there. During the course of each of their massages, the therapist providing the massage proceeded to massage the men's genitals with her hand. The therapist massaged the genitals until ejaculation. At that point, the both men stated that they paid the woman an additional sum of money and left.

Detective Stack used this information to support his application for search a seizure warrant. On February the 9th, 2009, Detective Stack applied for a search and seizure warrant for the premises at Grandview Therapy. The application was for him to enter the premises and seize any evidence related to prostitution related activities. In his application for that search and seizure warrant, Detective Stack stated under oath that based on his training and expertise, he believed that prostitution related activities were occurring at Grandview Therapy.

Detective Stack prepared to serve this warrant on February the 12th, 2009. But prior to doing so, he continued to observe the activities that were ongoing there. On that date, Detective Stack interviewed a man whom he saw leaving Grandview Therapy. This client he interviewed stated that he went to Grandview after seeing the advertisement in the Washington Post. His story matched that of the other clients who had been interviewed. That individual later identified Aecha Olivarria. According to this individual's statement, Ms. Olivarria offered him a shower, which he took. After which, Ms. Olivarria gave him a massage that culminated in her massaging his penis until he ejaculated. According to his statement, the client then gave her an additional sum of money for this sexual service. Additionally, the client interviewed stated that he had been to Grandview Therapy on other occasions. On each of these occasions, his massage included rubbing of his genitals by the therapist, but no ejaculation.

After the interview, Detective Stack entered the Grandview Therapy. Detective Stack did so posing by pretending to be a customer. Detective Stack was let in by a receptionist, who did not have a license with the Board. A few moments later, several officers entered Grandview along with Detective Stack.

As the police entered, Ms. Snyder screamed something out, presumably in Korean to the receptionist. Immediately prior to the entry by the police, Ms. Snyder was in an adjoining room which had a closed circuit television camera trained on the door. Detective Stack and his fellow officers found was another licensee, Ms. Palladinetti hiding in closet. They found Ms. Olivarria in a massage room with a naked man. The naked client was interviewed by the police. The client said that he had disrobed, then Ms. Olivarria, walked on his back at which point the police entered. He also stated that he too had patronized Grandview on two other occasions. And on those occasions, he had paid a sum of money after which an Asian female gave him a massage during which time the woman stimulated his genitals with her hand.

Ms. Olivarria was taken outside for identification. Another client the police stopped earlier identified Ms. Olivarria as the woman who had provided him sexual services for money. The police seized a number of items in the raid: \$3,657 in cash; a posting from the USA Sex Guide Forum and the series of massage records. All three of these licensees were arrested and charged with prostitution. All three appeared in the Montgomery County District Court. However, their cases were not prosecuted. Their cases were placed on the "stet docket." All three agreed to forfeit the money that the police recovered and that they agreed not to practice massage therapy in Montgomery County.

Marc Ware

Marc Ware, Board Investigator, was called to testify by the state. Mr. Ware investigated this matter for the Board. Mr. Ware stated that he reviewed Ms. Olivarria's,

Ms. Paladiniti's and Ms. Snyder's cases. Mr. Ware searched Maryland's Judiciary Case Search to look up the charges against all three Respondents. Specifically, Mr. Ware obtained information about the charges filed against the individuals for their actions at Grandview Therapy. After receiving this information, Mr. Ware subpoenaed information on these cases from the courts. Mr. Ware obtained the statement of charges for all three Respondents.

Mr. Ware interviewed all three Respondents. All three were instructed by counsel to not answer his questions about their employment at Grandview Therapy. Mr. Ware reviewed all of the health records maintained by the Respondents. The Respondents could only produce 90 health intake forms. There were no proper SOAP notes or any other kind of records detailing the treatment provided by any of the therapists at Grandview Therapy. The health intake forms appeared to be initialed by Ms. Snyder and Ms. Olivarria. Mr. Ware's investigative report was admitted to evidence as exhibit 1A.

Yong Snyder

Ms. Snyder testified on own her behalf with the assistance of an interpreter. Ms. Snyder provided very few details about the activities that took place at Grandview Therapy. She stated that she provided massage and that she signed some of the intake forms. Ms. Snyder did not elaborate on her practice of massage therapy at Grandview Therapy. Ms. Snyder denied being a lookout. She explained that the closed circuit cameras were used to protect Grandview Therapy from robbers. Ms. Snyder stated that she was not warning her fellow licensees about the police raid on the night at

issue. She explained that she thought that Detective Stack and the raiding party were robbers.

The Board did not find Ms. Snyder to be a credible witness. Her actions and her story did not square. Ms. Snyder claims that she was not functioning as a look out, but she did admit to shouting a warning to her co-workers when the police entered. Ms. Snyder admitted that she was in a room with a closed circuit television monitor broadcasting the transmission from Grandview Therapy's security system.

Ms. Snyder could not adequately explain the legitimate massage therapy taking place at Grandview Therapy. For example, Ms. Snyder did not explain why Ms. Olivarria was caught with a naked, undraped patient during the raid. Ms. Snyder did not elaborate on the intake sheets provided as a treatment records. Neither Ms. Palladinetti, nor Ms. Olivarria testified at the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the testimony and the exhibits presented at the evidentiary hearing, the Board finds the following facts to be true by a preponderance of the evidence:

1. At all times relevant to these charges, the Respondent was and is licensed to practice massage therapy in the State of Maryland. The Respondent was initially licensed to practice massage therapy in Maryland on March 8, 2001, under License Number M01385.

2. At all times relevant to these charges, the Respondent worked at Grandview Therapy ("Grandview"), located at 11308 Grandview Avenue, Wheaton,

Maryland 20902. Grandview advertises that it provides various forms of therapeutic massage.

3. The Board initiated an investigation of the Respondent after receiving correspondence, dated March 3, 2009, from Detective Thomas Stack ("Detective Stack") of the Vice and Intelligence Section of the Montgomery County Police Department. Detective Stack reported that his unit arrested three individuals who possess active massage therapy licenses during the execution of a search and seizure warrant at Grandview on February 12, 2009. Detective Stack identified the three licensees who were arrested as: the Respondent; Yeon Palladinetti (License Number M01045); and Yong Snyder (License Number M01138). Detective Stack reported that all three licensees were charged with committing prostitution-related crimes.

4. The Board then conducted an investigation of this matter, the results of which are set forth infra.

5. On or about February 9, 2009, Detective Stack applied for a search and seizure warrant for Grandview, for evidence involving prostitution-related activities. In his affidavit, Detective Stack affirmed the following:

(a) That on January 31, 2009, while in the performance of his official duties, he reviewed a web posting that was placed in the Montgomery County subsection of an Internet website, The USA Sex Guide Forum (the "Forum"), which is devoted to discussions about various forms of prostitution. Posters to the Forum detail their experiences in order to inform other readers about the services they purportedly received from

prostitutes or massage parlors. On this date, the Forum contained a posting regarding Grandview. This posting described the experiences of an individual who purportedly went to Grandview for a massage and sexual services in exchange for a sum of money. The poster reported that he received a massage from a woman who offered to perform a sexual act on him, for which he paid a sum of money. Based on his training and experience, he recognized that the web poster used vernacular consistent with prostitution and the exchange of money for sexual acts.

- (b) That between January 31, 2009 and February 6, 2009, he conducted surveillance of Grandview. He stated that on two separate occasions, he observed a male leave the premises at Grandview. He separately interviewed the individuals, who stated that they learned about Grandview from an advertisement in the Sports section of the Washington Post. Both individuals stated that they entered Grandview and paid a sum of money for massages. The individuals both stated that a woman at Grandview provided a massage, which culminated in her performing a sexual act on them.

6. On or about February 12, 2009, Detective Stack and other members of the Montgomery County Police Department conducted additional surveillance of Grandview prior to executing the search and seizure warrant. Detective Stack interviewed an adult male whom he observed leave the premises at Grandview. The individual stated that he entered Grandview and was greeted by an Asian female whom he paid a sum of money for a massage. The female took the individual into a massage room where he was left to

undress. Shortly thereafter, the Respondent entered and offered him a shower and sauna. The Respondent then escorted the individual back to the massage room, where he remained unclothed and draped with a sheet. The Respondent then performed a massage on the individual. During the massage, the Respondent sexually stimulated the individual's genitals until he ejaculated. After completing the act, the individual gave the Respondent an additional sum of money.

7. Detective Stack, posing as a customer, then knocked on the front door of Grandview and was led in by a female. Other members of Detective Stack's unit then approached the door of Grandview, at which point another massage therapy licensee, Yong Snyder, who was on the premises, shouted something in Korean while let Detective Stack was let into the premises. Ms. Snyder was in an office watching cameras that showed Detective Stack's fellow officers approaching the front door of Grandview.

8. Detective Stack and members of the Montgomery County Police Department then executed the search and seizure warrant and recovered \$3657.00 in United States currency, the posting from the Forum, and a series of survey sheets containing suspected false names and obviously incorrect or false information. Police found another massage therapy licensee, Yeon Palladinetti, hiding in a closet on the premises at Grandview.

9. At the time of the execution of the search and seizure warrant, members of Detective Stack's squad found the Respondent in a massage room with a male who was completely naked. Police interviewed this individual, who stated that he paid for a

massage, but was interrupted from further contact when the police entered. He stated that he had patronized Grandview on two prior occasions and that both times he paid a sum of money for a massage, which was performed by a woman. During the course of the massage, the woman sexually stimulated his genitals, after which the individual paid her an additional sum of money.

10. The Respondent was arrested on the scene and was charged with two counts of prostitution, in violation of Md. Criminal Law Code Ann. § 11-306. On or about April 9, 2009, the Respondent appeared in the District Court of Maryland for Montgomery County, at which time the charges against her were placed on the stet docket pursuant to Md. Rule 4-248, subject to the following conditions: the Respondent agreed to forfeiture of the United States currency that was seized during the execution of the search and seizure warrant on Grandview on February 12, 2009; and agreed not to practice massage therapy in Montgomery County, Maryland.

11. Pursuant to its investigation, the Board issued the Respondent a *subpoena duces tecum*, dated May 28, 2009, requesting that she provide for inspection ten patient treatment records and supplemental documents (including but not limited to files, invoices, letters, bills, insurance documentation, memoranda, S.O.A.P. notes, office appointment and calendar notations). The Respondent failed to provide any records in response to the Board's request.

12. Board investigation determined that the Respondent failed to record or maintain sufficient written, legible, organized treatment records of treatment of clients under her care as required under Maryland law and regulations.

13. On June 15, 2009, the Respondent was interviewed by the Board. During the interview, the Respondent would not answer the Board's questions about Grand Therapy. The Respondent chose to remain silent and invoke her rights under the Fifth Amendment.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Respondent's actions, as described above, constitute, in whole or in part, a violation of one or more provisions of the Act. The state produced evidence that the Respondents were working in a house of prostitution. Detective Stack interviewed several customers who stated that the services they received at Grandview Therapy were sexual and not massage. In addition, the prosecution produced a print out of the USA Sex Guide message board, where there were several posters who stated that they had paid for sex (under the guise of massage therapy) at Grandview Therapy. (Ex. 4c).

During the course of the Board's investigation, the Respondent was interviewed. The Respondent would not answer any questions about her employment at Grandview Therapy. The Respondent did provide some information in response to interrogatories from the Board. However, the Respondent's answers to the Board's questions were too vague and not specific.

On the night of her arrest, the Respondent was found with a naked client. The Respondent was identified by a client as the individual who had provided him sexual services in exchange for money. Providing sexual services is not part of the practice of massage therapy.

The Respondents could not produce sufficient records to prove that they treated patients with proper, legal massage. The records provided only generally state that massage was or was to be performed. No witnesses testified that they had received massage therapy to address an underlying medical condition. Again, the Respondent did not provide the Board with an explanation of her massage therapy practice at Grandview Therapy.

First, the Board finds that the Respondent fraudulently or deceptively using a license or registration, in violation of H.O. § 3-5A-11(a)(2). The Board is sanctioning the Respondent for working at and displaying their licenses at Grandview Therapy. Grandview Therapy was a brothel or house of prostitution that held itself out to the public as a massage therapy business. The Respondent's license was used by Grandview Therapy to maintain this façade. The Board believes that it was not possible for any of the Respondents to work at Grandview Therapy and maintain that they were ignorant to the prostitution occurring on the premises. Additionally, a client identified the Respondent as the individual who had provided him sexual services in exchange for money.

The Board finds that the Respondent did not perform massage therapy in a manner with generally accepted professional standards, in violation of H.O. § 3-5A-11(a)(8). Based on the record, the Respondents collectively and individually did not properly document treatment. None of the Respondents produced any records to adequately substantiate the fact that they were providing massage therapy to clients at Grandview Therapy. The intake sheets produced do not provide sufficient details regarding the treatment performed. Intake sheets are not a substitute for actual

documentation of treatment. Only, Ms. Snyder produced any records outside of the intake sheets seized by the police. The records produced by Ms. Snyder do not have any therapist's signature on them or properly document the treatment provided.

The evidence indicates that there was prostitution occurring on the premises of Grandview Therapy. The record shows that the Respondents individually and collectively offered massage therapy services. Practicing massage therapy in a house of prostitution is unacceptable. The Board finds that the Respondent's failure to document treatment and willingness to use her license to further Grandview Therapy's scheme to offer prostitution under the guise of massage therapy violates generally accepted professional standards. Additionally, the Respondent was identified by a witness as providing sexual services for money.

The Board believes that the facts of this case support finding that the Respondent that violated the other provisions of the practice act cited in the charging document. The Board finds that the Respondent engaged in conduct that violates the professional code of ethics, in violation of H.O. § 3-5A-11(a)(20); and/or knowingly performed an act that has been determined by the Board to be a violation of the Board's regulations, in violation of H.O. § 3-5A-11(a)(21).

The Respondent violated the Board's code of ethics. Specifically COMAR 10.43.18.02(B)(2), which states licensees shall not provide "Non Bona Fide" treatment. Sexual contact is not part of massage therapy and is not bona fide treatment. For this reason alone, the Respondent's conduct violated the Board's regulations.

The Respondent's actions, as described above, are found to constitute, in whole or in part, a violation of one or more of the following COMAR regulations: Standards of Practice, COMAR 10.43.18.03D(2)(a), (b), and (c). This provision prohibits a licensee from "knowingly engag[ing] in or condon[ing] behavior that is fraudulent, dishonest, deceitful or involves moral turpitude." The Respondent used her license as a means to offer sexual services for money. This conduct squarely violates the Board's Standards of Practice.

The Respondent did not properly document the treatment she provided to clients. The in-take sheets provided did not provide any detailed information about the services provided and who provided them. In accordance with COMAR 10.43.18.04A(4), all licensees are required to "maintain legible, organized written records of treatment of any client under the care of the certificate holder or registration holder for at least 5 years..." The Respondent did not produce her records from the last five years. The records produced did not properly document the treatment provided.

Finally, the Respondent did not maintain professional boundaries in her practice. Licensees may not engage in sexual conduct, even when the client initiates it. See COMAR 10.43.18.05A(1). The Respondents conduct also violated COMAR 10.43.18.05B(2), (3)(b) and (c), which holds that a licensee cannot provide non bona fide treatment or engage in a sexual relationship with a client.

The Board does not find that the respondent violated COMAR 10.43.18.03C(2), (3), (6) and/or (7).

SANCTION

The Respondent is an experienced massage therapist. The Respondent's lack of knowledge of the Board's statute and regulations is troubling to the Board. Practicing in a setting where prostitution was taking place is unacceptable. The Respondent failed to document her treatment of patients. The Respondent's behavior does not meet the standards that the public is entitled to expect from a licensed professional.

The Respondent's actions during the course of the investigation also are unimpressive to the Board, to say the least. The Board expects, and the regulations require, that licensees will fully cooperate with the Board investigator. In addition, when responding to the Board regarding a complaint, anything less than full disclosure is misleading to the Board and in violation of the regulations. The Respondent has at no time acknowledged any error or misconduct on her part. On the contrary, she has said, or not said, whatever he has needed to in order to avoid admitting any wrongdoing. The Board takes a very dim view of licensees involving themselves in prostitution. The Board will not tolerate licensed, professional practice of massage therapists practicing and/or aiding in the practice of prostitution. For these reasons, the Board revokes the Respondent's license.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is this 11th day of August 2011 that the majority of the Board hereby:

ORDERED that the license of **AECHA OLIVARRIA**, to practice massage therapy is hereby **REVOKED**; and it is further

ORDERED that, the Respondent shall **not be permitted apply to reinstate her license for five (5) years;** and it is further


ORDERED that, the Respondent shall **immediately surrender her Board license, license wallet card and wall certificate** to: J. J. Vallone, Exec. Director, Suite 301, 4201 Patterson Ave., Baltimore, MD 21212-2299.

ORDERED that for purposes of public disclosure and as permitted by Md. State Govt. Code Ann. § 10-617(h) (2009 Repl. Vol.), 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. State Govt. Code Ann. §§ 10-601 *et seq.* (2009 Repl. Vol.).

August 11th, 2011

Date



Stephanie J. Chaney, D.C., President
Board of Chiropractic & Massage
Therapy Examiners

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Pursuant to Maryland Health Occ. Code Ann. § 3-316, you have a right to take a direct judicial appeal. A petition for appeal shall be filed within thirty (30) days from mailing 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.