

IN THE MATTER OF
JOANNA M. MYERS, PA-C

Respondent

License Number: C0009400

BEFORE THE
MARYLAND STATE BOARD

OF PHYSICIANS

Case Number: 2225-0176

ORDER OF DEFAULT

On November 6, 2025, Disciplinary Panel A of the Maryland State Board of Physicians (“Board”) issued Charges under the Maryland Physician Assistants Practice Act, alleging that Respondent, Joanna Myers, PA-C, was disciplined by a licensing or disciplinary authority for an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action in Maryland, in violation of Health Occ. §15-314(a)(21), and that she allowed her license to expire or lapse while she was subject to investigation or disciplinary action by a licensing or disciplinary authority for an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action in Maryland, in violation of Health Occ. §15-314(a)(24)(ii).

With respect to Health Occ. § 15-314(a)(21) and (24)(ii), the acts for which Ms. Myers was disciplined in Virginia would be grounds for disciplinary action under the following provisions of Health Occ. § 15-314(a): (3) Is guilty of: (ii) Unprofessional conduct in the practice of medicine; (22) Fails to meet appropriate standards for the delivery of quality medical and surgical care performed in an outpatient surgical facility, office, hospital, or any other location in this State; and (40) Fails to keep adequate medical records.

On February 19, 2026, the case was referred to the Office of Administrative Hearings (“OAH”) for an evidentiary hearing. On February 27, 2026, OAH mailed a Notice of Remote Scheduling Conference to each party at their address of record. On March 11, 2026, the Notice was returned to the OAH marked “Forward Time Expired - Return to sender” and noted an address in Martinsburg, West Virginia. On March 17, 2026, OAH sent a second Notice of Remote

Scheduling Conference to Ms. Myers at her original address of record and to the Martinsburg, WV address. The Notice informed Ms. Myers that a Scheduling Conference would be held on April 6, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., by video-conference. The scheduling conference notice sent to the Martinsburg, WV address was not returned as undeliverable. On April 6, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) commenced the Scheduling Conference by video-conference. The administrative prosecutor appeared on behalf of the State. Ms. Myers did not appear, nor did counsel appear on her behalf. During the Scheduling Conference, a prehearing conference was scheduled for May 7, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.

The ALJ issued a Scheduling Order, and, on April 8, 2026, OAH sent a notice of the remote prehearing conference. OAH sent the Scheduling Order and the Notice to Ms. Myers at her address of record and to the Martinsburg, WV address. The correspondence sent to her address of record was returned to OAH as undeliverable, but the correspondence sent to the Martinsburg, WV address was not returned as undeliverable. The Notice stated that the prehearing conference was scheduled for May 7, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. and that failure to attend the prehearing conference might result in a decision against the non-appearing party.

On May 7, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. the ALJ convened the remote prehearing conference by video-conference. The administrative prosecutor appeared on behalf of the State. After waiting more than twenty minutes after the scheduled start time, Ms. Myers did not appear and no one appeared on her behalf. Ms. Myers did not request a postponement or notify OAH of any technical issues with logging on. The State moved for a default against Ms. Myers.

Under OAH’s rules of procedure, “[i]f, after receiving proper notice as provided in Regulation .05C of this chapter, a party fails to attend or participate, either personally or through a representative, in a Prehearing Conference, hearing, or other stage of a proceeding, the ALJ may

proceed in that party's absence or may, in accordance with the hearing authority delegated by the agency, issue a final or proposed default order against the defaulting party." COMAR 28.02.01.23A.

On May 14, 2026, the ALJ issued a Proposed Default Order. The ALJ found that Ms. Myers failed to appear despite having received proper notice. The ALJ proposed that the Panel find Ms. Myers in default, but did not make any proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, or recommend a sanction.

The ALJ mailed, by regular first-class mail, copies of the Proposed Default Order to Ms. Myers at the Martinsburg, WV address and via email. The Proposed Default Order notified the parties that they may file written exceptions to the proposed order but must do so within 15 days of the date of the Proposed Default Order. The Proposed Default Order stated that any exceptions and requests for a hearing must be sent to the Board with a copy provided to the opposing party. On May 20, 2026, the Board sent a letter to both parties explaining the exceptions process and stating that any exceptions were due to the Board on June 1, 2026 and any response to exceptions was due on June 19, 2026. The letter also informed the parties that if exceptions were filed, an exceptions hearing would be held at the Board on July 22, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. The letter was sent to Ms. Myers at her Martinsburg address of record, her business address of record, and sent via email. On June 1, 2026, the State filed exceptions to the ALJ's Proposed Decision. Ms. Myers did not file a response to the State's exceptions or file her own exceptions. On July 22, 2026, this case came before Disciplinary Panel B ("Panel B" or "the Panel") of the Board for an exceptions hearing. The State appeared and was represented by an administrative prosecutor. After waiting more than 55 minutes after the scheduled start time of the hearing, Ms. Myers did not appear, nor

did anyone appear on her behalf. The Panel heard from the State and now issues this final decision and order following the exceptions hearing.

EXCEPTIONS

In filing exceptions, the State took exception to the ALJ's omissions in issuing the proposed decision without any Proposed Findings of Fact, Proposed Conclusions of Law or a Proposed Disposition. The State requested that the Panel issue a Final Decision and Order that makes Findings of Fact consistent with the Allegations of Fact as set forth in the charging document and Conclusions of Law as set forth in the charging document. As far as a sanction, the State requested that the Panel revoke Ms. Myers's license because of her failure to participate in and her choice to ignore the proceedings demonstrated that she is uninterested in maintaining her physician assistant's licensure in Maryland. The Respondent was served with the Charges and properly notified of the Scheduling Conference and Prehearing Conference. Notwithstanding being duly served with proper notices, the Respondent chose to ignore these administrative proceedings.

The Panel has considered the written exceptions and the oral presentation of the State. The Panel agrees with the ALJ's proposed decision to find Ms. Myers in Default and grants the State's exceptions requesting the Panel to adopt the allegations of fact as findings of fact, adopt the grounds charged in the charging document as conclusions of law, and impose the sanction of revocation.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Because Panel B concludes that Ms. Myers has defaulted and has not filed exceptions to the ALJ's Proposed Default Order, the following findings of fact are adopted from the allegations of fact in the charging document and are deemed proven by the preponderance of the evidence:

1. The Respondent was licensed to practice as a physician assistant in the State of Maryland. The Respondent was initially licensed in Maryland on or about May 17, 2024.

2. By the Consent Order (the “Consent Order”) dated March 15, 2025, the Virginia Board of Medicine (the “Virginia Board”) made certain findings of fact and concluded that the Respondent violated various provisions of the Virginia Code governing the practice of medicine as a physician assistant.

3. In the Consent Order, the Virginia Board found on two separate occasions in October 2023, the Respondent prescribed Bactrim and clonazepam to a male coworker (“Patient A”), who had a history of treatment with Adderall, oxycodone, diazepam, lorazepam, and alprazolam, without a practitioner-patient relationship.

4. The Virginia Board also found that from December 2023 through February 2024, the Respondent violated the “Regulations Governing the Prescribing of Opioids and Buprenorphine”¹ regarding her care and treatment of Patient A.

5. Specifically, while treating Patient A, who had a history of illicit drug use, the Respondent failed to consult with the patient’s prior treatment provider and failed to obtain prior treatment records.

6. Additionally, the Respondent failed to determine the etiology of Patient A’s rectal pain before prescribing the patient #10 oxycodone IR 15 mg and without “considering a nonpharmacologic or non-opioid treatment” or conducting a query of the Prescription Monitoring Program, “which would have revealed that Patient A was previously prescribed #15 oxycodone IR 10 mg” by another provider in December 2023.

¹ Specifically, the Respondent was in violation of Virginia Administrative Code, 18 VAC 85-21-30A governing the prescribing of opioids and buprenorphine.

7. Furthermore, the Respondent reported to the Virginia Board investigators that she “began cohabitating with Patient A between Patient A’s initial visit in [December 2023 and February 2024].”

8. By the Consent Order dated March 13, 2025, the Virginia Board disciplined the Respondent by issuing a reprimand, placing restrictions on her controlled substances privileges by ordering her to cease all prescribing to Patient A, placing her license on probation for twelve (12) months, and ordering her to complete ten (10) credit hours of Virginia Board-approved courses in the subject of boundaries and ethics and proper prescribing.

9. By letter dated April 28, 2025, the Board notified the Respondent that it is conducting an investigation of her based on the Consent Order she signed with the Virginia Board.

10. On June 30, 2025, the Respondent allowed her physician assistant license in Maryland to expire without filing for a renewal.^[2]

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Panel B finds Ms. Myers in default based upon her failure to appear at or participate at the Prehearing Conference on May 7, 2026, at OAH. *See* State Gov’t § 10-210(4); COMAR 28.02.01.23A. Based upon the foregoing findings of fact, Panel B concludes that Ms. Myers was disciplined by a licensing or disciplinary authority for an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action in Maryland, in violation of Health Occ. §15-314(a)(21), and that she allowed her license to expire or lapse while she was subject to investigation or disciplinary action by a licensing or disciplinary authority for an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action in Maryland, in violation of Health Occ. §15-314(a)(24)(ii). The grounds underlying the violation of Health Occ. § 15-314(a)(21) are Health Occ. § 15-314(a)(3)(ii), (22), and (40).

² Pursuant to Health Occ. § 15-312(a), the Respondent’s license did not lapse by operation of law because the Board notified Ms. Myers of its investigation on April 28, 2025, prior to the expiration of her license.

SANCTION

Based on the entirety of the findings of fact and conclusions of law, Panel B agrees with the State that the revocation of Ms. Myers's license to practice medicine as a physician assistant in Maryland is warranted.

ORDER

It is, on the affirmative vote of a majority of the quorum of Panel B, hereby

ORDERED that the license of Joanna M. Myers, PA-C to practice medicine as a physician assistant in Maryland, is **REVOKED**; and it is further

ORDERED that this Order of Default goes into effect upon the signature of the Board's Executive Director. The Board's Executive Director signs this Order of Default on behalf of Panel B; and it is further

ORDERED that this is a public document.

08/20/2026
Date

Signature on File

Christine A. Farrelly, Executive Director
Maryland State Board of Physicians

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

Pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 15-315, Ms. Myers has the right to seek judicial review of this Order of Default. Any petition for judicial review shall be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of mailing of this Order of Default. The date of the cover letter accompanying this Order is the date the decision was mailed. Any petition for judicial review shall be made as provided for in the Administrative Procedure Act, Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-222 and Title 7, Chapter 200 of the Maryland Rules of Procedure.

If Ms. Myers files a petition for judicial review, the Board is a party and should be served with the court's process at the following address:

**Maryland State Board of Physicians
Christine A. Farrelly, Executive Director
4201 Patterson Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21215**

Notice of any petition should also be sent to the Board's counsel at the following address:

**Stacey Darin
Assistant Attorney General
Maryland Department of Health
300 West Preston Street, Suite 302
Baltimore, Maryland 21201**