

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**NIRANJAN MITTAL, M.D.**

**Respondent**

**License Number: D29795**

**BEFORE THE**

**MARYLAND STATE**

**BOARD OF PHYSICIANS**

**Case Number: 2226-0040B**

---

**FINAL DECISION AND ORDER**

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Niranjan Mittal, M.D., was originally licensed to practice medicine in the State of Maryland, on September 1, 1983, under license number D29795. On February 10, 2025, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Case Number 1:23-cr-00648-RA, Dr. Mittal pled guilty to one count of violating the federal Anti-Kickback Statute, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1320a-7b(b)(2)(A). On August 21, 2025, the Court sentenced Dr. Mittal to thirty-seven months of incarceration, followed by two years of supervised release.

On January 30, 2026, the Office of the Attorney General filed with the Maryland Board of Physicians (the "Board") a petition to revoke Dr. Mittal's license to practice medicine ("the Petition") and a proposed show cause order pursuant to section 14-404(b)(2) of the Maryland Medical Practice Act. The statute provides:

- (1) On the filing of certified docket entries with the Board by the Office of the Attorney General, a disciplinary panel shall order the suspension of a license if the licensee is convicted of or pleads guilty or nolo contendere with respect to a crime involving moral turpitude, whether or not any appeal or other proceeding is pending to have the conviction or plea set aside.
- (2) After completion of the appellate process if the conviction has not been reversed or the plea has not been set aside with respect to a crime involving moral turpitude, a disciplinary panel shall order the revocation of a license on the certification by the Office of the Attorney General.

Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 14-404(b) (Lexis Nexis Supp. 2021.). Attached to the Petition were certified copies of the docket entries and the judgment. The show cause order directed Dr. Mittal to show cause, in writing, on or before March 4, 2026, if there were any reason why his license to practice medicine in Maryland should not be revoked. Dr. Mittal did not respond to the Petition.

Having reviewed and considered the entire record in this case, Panel B issues this Final Decision and Order. COMAR 10.32.02.07H(1).

### FINDINGS OF FACT

Panel B finds the following:

1. Niranjan Mittal, M.D., was originally licensed to practice medicine in the State of Maryland, on September 1, 1983, under license number D29795.
2. On December 11, 2023, a grand jury in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York returned a sealed indictment charging Dr. Mittal with one count of Attempted and Conspiracy to Commit Health Care Fraud and Wire Fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1349, one count of Healthcare Fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1347, one count of conspiracy to violate the Anti-Kickback statute, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, and one count of Payment to a Non-Licensed Physician (Violation of Anti-Kickback Statute), in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1320. On February 10, 2025, Dr. Mittal pled guilty to one count of violating the federal Anti-Kickback Statute, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1320a-7b(b)(2)(A).<sup>1</sup>
3. In pleading guilty, Dr. Mittal admitted:

I operated a medical practice which provided a radius of vascular and cardiology services. To expand my practice, I often leased medical office space from different internists and general family practices. I did this to get more patient referrals. These offices were all across New York City, including [the] Bronx. For a period of years, as charged in the indictment, I realized that I could get more patient referrals if I paid the doctor whose space I rented money

---

<sup>1</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 1320a-7b(b)(2)(A) provides:

Whoever knowingly and willfully offers or pays any remuneration (including any kickback, bribe, or rebate) directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, in cash or in kind to any person to induce such person to refer an individual to a person for the furnishing or arranging for the furnishing of any item or service for which payment may be made in whole or in part under a Federal health care program . . . shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$100,000 or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

to induce them to refer patients to me. I agree that I paid these doctors in exchange for patient referrals. I agree that these set payments violated the federal health care laws, and I sincerely apologize to the Court for my conduct.

4. On August 21, 2025, the Court sentenced Dr. Mittal to thirty-seven months of incarceration, followed by two years of supervised release.
5. Dr. Mittal did not appeal his conviction within the time prescribed by law and the guilty plea and conviction have not been set aside.

### **DISCUSSION**

Pursuant to COMAR 10.32.02.07E(2), Dr. Mittal had the opportunity to respond to the order to show cause, in writing, to address the following limited issues: “(a) Lack of conviction or plea; (b) Whether the crime is one involving moral turpitude; (c) Misidentity of the respondent with the defendant in the criminal matter; and (d) Other relevant issues, if any, other than mitigation.” Dr. Mittal did not respond to the Petition, and therefore, he does not dispute that he pled guilty to a crime involving moral turpitude and does not dispute that his license should be revoked.

Under Health Occ. §14-404(b)(2), a disciplinary panel has the obligation and discretion to determine what types of crimes are crimes involving moral turpitude for licensing and disciplinary purposes. “[I]t is settled that whatever else [moral turpitude] may mean . . . a crime in which an intent to defraud is an essential element is a crime involving moral turpitude. It is also settled that the related group of offenses involving intentional dishonesty for purposes of personal gain are crimes involving moral turpitude[.]” *Attorney Grievance Comm’n of Md. v. Walman*, 280 Md. 453, 459-60 (1977). “[I]n the context of a licensing board’s review of the conduct of its licensee, the concept of moral turpitude is rather broad.” *Oltman v. Maryland State Bd. of Physicians*, 162 Md. App. 457, 483 (2005). In the licensure context, “[t]he term ‘moral turpitude’ has been defined generally as importing ‘an act of baseness, vileness or depravity in the private and social duties

which a man owes to his fellow men, or to society in general, contrary to the accepted and customary rule of right and duty between man and man.” *Attorney Grievance Comm’n of Md. v. Walman*, 280 Md. 453, 459 (quoting *Braverman v. Bar Ass’n of Balt. City*, 209 Md. 328, 344, *cert. denied*, 352 U.S. 830 (1956)).

“Determining whether an individual has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude ‘necessarily begins with an examination of the criminal statute itself.’” *Burke v. Maryland Bd. of Physicians*, 250 Md. App. 334, 348 (2021) (quoting *Walman*, 280 Md. at 460). “If the criminal statute does not establish moral turpitude on its face, then the analysis ‘hinges on the facts present in the individual case at hand.’” *Id.* (quoting *Walman*, 280 Md. at 460). Maryland appellate courts have repeatedly held that, if dishonesty, fraud, or intent to deceive is an essential element of a statute under which a defendant is convicted, the crime involves moral turpitude as a matter of law. *See Board of Physician Quality Assurance v. Felsenberg*, 351 Md. 288, 295 (1998) (crimes involving fraud are crimes involving moral turpitude); *Attorney Grievance Comm’n v. Klauber*, 289 Md. 446, 457-59, *cert. denied*, 451 U.S. 1018 (1981) (the term “moral turpitude” connotes a fraudulent or dishonest intent); *Walman*, 280 Md. at 459-60; *Oltman*, 162 Md. App. at 485-87.

The crime Dr. Mittal pled guilty to is knowingly and willfully paying the doctors whose office space he rented money in exchange for patient referrals, which included services that were reimbursed by Medicare or Medicaid, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1320a-7b(b)(2)(A). Thus, the elements of the crime and the factual basis for the crime of violating the federal Anti-Kickback Statute involved intentional dishonesty for purposes of personal gain, which constitutes a crime involving moral turpitude. *Walman*, 280 Md. at 459-60.

Upon determining that a licensee has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, Health Occ. § 14-404(b)(2) requires a disciplinary panel to order the revocation of a license after the appellate proceedings have been completed.

### CONCLUSION OF LAW

Based on the above findings of fact and discussion, Panel B concludes that Dr. Mittal's conviction for violating the federal Anti-Kickback Statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1320a-7b(b)(2)(A), is a crime involving moral turpitude. As a result, Health Occ. § 14-404(b)(2) requires Panel B to order the revocation of Dr. Mittal's medical license.

### ORDER

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

**ORDERED** that the license of Niranjan Mittal, M.D., license number D29795, to practice medicine in Maryland is **REVOKED**, as mandated by Health Occ. § 14-404(b)(2); and it is further

**ORDERED** that this is a **PUBLIC DOCUMENT**. See Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. §§ 1-607, 14-411.1(b)(2) and Gen. Prov. § 4-333(b)(6).

05/22/2026  
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. § 14-408, Dr. Mittal has the right to seek judicial review of this Final Decision and Order. Any petition for judicial review shall be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of mailing of this Final Decision and Order. The date of this Final

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

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

Notice of any petition for judicial review should also be sent to the Board's counsel at the following address and emailed to [Stacey.darin@maryland.gov](mailto:Stacey.darin@maryland.gov):

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