

IN THE MATTER OF
ANISSA MAROOF, M.D.

Respondent

License Number D70991

BEFORE THE
MARYLAND STATE
BOARD OF PHYSICIANS

Case Number: 2225-0189A

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Anissa Maroof, M.D., was originally licensed to practice medicine in the State of Maryland, on June 15, 2010, under license number D70991. On or about February 28, 2025, the United States Attorney's Office (the "USAO") filed a Criminal Indictment (the "Indictment") against Dr. Maroof in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in *United States of America v. Anissa Maroof*, Case No. TDC-24-066. The USAO charged Dr. Maroof with, among other things, Distribution and Dispensing of Controlled Substances, in violation of 21 United States Code ("U.S.C.") § 841(a)(1). The Indictment alleges that Dr. Maroof knowingly, intentionally, and unlawfully dispensed and distributed, and caused to be dispensed and distributed, through prescriptions that were issued outside the usual course of professional practice and not for a legitimate medical purpose, controlled substances including alprazolam, amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and buprenorphine.

On or about May 9, 2025, Dr. Maroof entered into a plea agreement whereby she agreed to plead guilty to Count One of the Indictment which charged her with Distribution and Dispensing of Alprazolam, Amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and Buprenorphine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1). During the plea hearing, on May 9, 2025, a United States District Court Judge advised Dr. Maroof that, by pleading guilty, she waived her right to a trial and any rights associated with a trial, including the right to appeal.

On or about August 25, 2025, Dr. Maroof was sentenced to imprisonment for fifteen months, to commence on October 20, 2025; followed by supervised release for two years; and a \$10,000 fine.

On March 4, 2026, the Office of the Attorney General filed with the Maryland Board of Physicians (the “Board”) a petition to revoke Dr. Maroof’s license to practice medicine (“the Petition”) and a proposed show cause order, pursuant to § 14-404(b) of the Health Occupations Article, Md. Code Ann., which 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.

Attached to the Petition were copies of the indictment, certified docket entries, certified plea agreement with the statement of facts, certified transcript of the re-arraignment hearing, and a certified sentencing hearing transcript and judgment.

On April 3, 2026, Dr. Maroof, through her counsel, filed a response to the Petition and show cause order and requested that the Panel agree to a Consent Order for Revocation that would allow her to petition for reinstatement one year after the date of the Order.

Having reviewed and considered the entire record in this case, Board Disciplinary Panel A (“Panel A” or the “Panel”) issues this Final Decision and Order. COMAR 10.32.02.07H(1).

FINDINGS OF FACT

Panel A finds the following:

1. On or about February 28, 2025, the USAO filed the Indictment against Dr. Maroof in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in *United States of America v. Anissa Maroof*, Case No. TDC-24-066. The USAO charged Dr. Maroof with seven counts of Distribution and Dispensing of Controlled Substances, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(C), and 18 U.S.C. § 2. The USAO also charged Dr. Maroof with one count of Opening, Using, and Maintaining a Drug-Involved Premises, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856(a)(1).

2. With respect to Counts 1-8, the Indictment alleges that Dr. Maroof did knowingly, intentionally, and unlawfully dispense and distribute, and cause to be dispensed and distributed, through prescriptions that were issued outside the usual course of professional practice and not for a legitimate medical purpose, controlled substances including alprazolam, amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and buprenorphine. Regarding Count Eight, the Indictment alleges that the Respondent did knowingly and intentionally open, lease, rent, use, and permanently and temporarily maintain a place, that is, her medical practice located in Bethesda, Maryland, for the purpose of distributing Schedule II, Schedule III, and Schedule IV controlled substances outside the usual course of professional practice and not for a legitimate medical purpose.

3. On or about May 9, 2025, Dr. Maroof entered into a plea agreement whereby she agreed to plead guilty to Count One of the Indictment which charged her with Distribution and Dispensing of Alprazolam, Amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and Buprenorphine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1).

4. Dr. Maroof stipulated and agreed to the Statement of Facts attached to the plea agreement as the factual basis in support of the criminal conviction.

5. The Statement of Facts, in part, states:

Between at least in or about January 2019 and June 2022, the [Respondent], ANISSA MAROOF, knowingly caused to be

distributed and dispensed Alprazolam (a Schedule IV controlled substance), Amphetamine-dextroamphetamine (a Schedule II controlled substance), and Buprenorphine (a Schedule III controlled substance), and did so knowing that the distribution and dispensing were outside the scope of professional practice and not for a legitimate medical purpose.

...

MAROOF owned and operated her own medical practice in Bethesda, Maryland and had a Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) registration number that authorized her to prescribe controlled substances.

Through her medical practice, MAROOF prescribed customers from West Virginia with prescriptions for controlled substances, including Alprazolam, Amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and Buprenorphine. ... MAROOF's customers included ... Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) undercover agents who posed as customers and recorded their visits with MAROOF

MAROOF prescribed customers combinations of Alprazolam, Amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and Buprenorphine without warning them about the risks of combining these medications. MAROOF prescribed customers Alprazolam without warning them about the risks of mixing Alprazolam with alcohol. MAROOF prescribed controlled substances to customers even after they indicated that they were selling their excess supply of controlled substances through illicit channels. MAROOF prescribed customers Buprenorphine even when the customers did not claim to be addicted to opiates or recovering from such an addiction. Customers provided MAROOF with the dosages that they wanted. MAROOF regularly prescribed customers controlled substances without providing them any therapeutic services. MAROOF failed to check readily accessible databases to ensure that her customers were not obtaining controlled substances from other physicians. MAROOF rarely performed urinalysis on her customers, even though they were purportedly drug addicts.

On numerous occasions, MAROOF called in prescriptions to local pharmacies without seeing the customer, and then directed the customer to leave cash under her office door in exchange for writing the prescription. MAROOF often advised customers how to split their prescriptions to be filled at different pharmacies.

6. During the plea hearing, on May 9, 2025, a United States District Court Judge advised Dr. Maroof that, by pleading guilty, she waived her right to a trial and any rights associated with a trial, including the right to appeal.

7. On or about August 25, 2025, Dr. Maroof was sentenced to imprisonment for fifteen months, to commence on October 20, 2025; followed by supervised release for two years; and a \$10,000 fine.

8. Dr. Maroof did not appeal her 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. Maroof has 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. Maroof’s response does not contest that she pled guilty to one charge of illegal distribution and dispensing of alprazolam, amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and buprenorphine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. 841. She admits that her prescribing actions were improper and violated the law and that she acted unprofessionally and unlawfully. She does not claim that her crime did not involve moral turpitude. Nor does she argue that she was misidentified as the defendant in the criminal case. Rather, Dr. Maroof requests a consent order with the revocation of her license.

It is unclear the basis under which Dr. Maroof is asking for a consent order. To the extent Dr. Maroof is asking the Board to consider a consent order under Health Occ. § 14-404(a), “the Board had the discretion to discipline [a physician] under [Health Occ.] § 14-404(a) or § 14-404(b).” *Burke v. Maryland Board of Physicians*, 250 Md. App. 334, 356 (2021). “[A] defendant

'has no constitutional right to elect which of two applicable statutes will form the basis of his indictment and prosecution[.]' [and] . . . the Board is permitted to proceed with summary disposition after an individual is convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude." *Burke*, 250 Md. App. at 356 (quoting *Maryland Bd. Of Physicians Quality Assur. v. Felsenberg*, 351 Md. 288, 306 (1998)).

To the extent Dr. Maroof is asking the Board to consider entering into a consent order, under Health Occ. 14-404(b) and COMAR 10.32.02.07E(2), Dr. Maroof provides improper mitigation. To support her request, she discusses her remorse, apologizes, claims that this was an isolated incident, discusses the stressors in her life at the time of the misconduct, and, in her own words, she presents "mitigating and moderating circumstances." Under COMAR 10.32.02.07E(2), mitigation issues are not proper for consideration in this case, and the Panel declines to bypass the regulations of COMAR 10.32.02.07 by entering into a consent order.

Crime Involving Moral Turpitude

Under Health Occ. §14-404(b), a disciplinary panel has the obligation and discretion to determine what types of crimes are crimes involving moral turpitude for licensing and disciplinary purposes. Maryland appellate courts have held that the term "moral turpitude" is more broadly defined with respect to Board licensure and discipline than in a witness impeachment context. *See Ricketts v. State*, 291 Md. 701, 711-12 (1981) ("[W]hat constitutes a crime of moral turpitude may involve different considerations compelling different results in different circumstances."). In the context of licensure and discipline, the term moral turpitude "strikes the broader chord of public confidence in the administration of government. That is, a person who has credibility to testify [at trial] may not have the public's confidence to practice certain professions[.]" *Stidwell v. Maryland State Bd. of Chiropractic Exam'rs*, 144 Md. App. 613, 619 (2002). Thus, it is well established that

“in the context of a licensing board’s review of the conduct of its licensee, the concept of moral turpitude is rather broad.” *Oltman v. Md. 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)).

“Conduct in violation of [laws prohibiting possession and distribution of controlled dangerous substances (“CDS”)] will ordinarily involve moral turpitude, [however] each case must be decided on its own facts.” *Attorney Grievance Com’n of Maryland v. Proctor*, 309 Md. 412,419 (1987), *see also Attorney Grievance Com’n of Maryland v. Marcalus*, 414 Md. 501, 520 (2010). “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.’” *Burke*, 250 Md. App. at 348.

In *Marcalus*, the Supreme Court of Maryland held that an attorney violated the Rules of Professional Conduct when he distributed his prescription medication Vicodin, a controlled substance, in exchange for a sexual act. The Court ruled that the attorney’s conduct, specifically the act of distributing a controlled substance, constituted a crime of moral turpitude. *Marcalus*, 414 Md. at 520.

In *Burke*, the Appellate Court of Maryland found that a physician’s guilty plea to five counts of prescribing CDS, specifically Oxycodone, Amphetamine, Alprazolam, and Diazepam, was outside the course of regular professional duties and not within conformity of the standards of his profession. *Burke*, 250 Md. App. at 348. The physician’s guilty plea constituted a crime of

moral turpitude which supported revocation of his license to practice medicine in the State of Maryland. *Id.* The Court further concluded:

[T]here is substantial evidence in the record to support the Board's conclusion that Dr. Burke's actions reflect negatively on "the many legitimate physicians who practice medicine in accordance with professional and ethical standards, and with respect for patient safety and societal values." The Board properly concluded that Dr. Burke's actions were "directly connected to the medical profession" and that in writing "illegal prescriptions of CDS," he brought "shame to the medical profession." While we afford great weight to the legal conclusions drawn by the Board and defer to its expertise in finding that Dr. Burke committed a crime that involved moral turpitude in the administrative sphere, we independently draw the same conclusion. Dr. Burke's actions negatively impact "public confidence" in the medical profession and cast an "unsavory . . . shadow" over the field. *Id.* at 353.

Based on the facts of the plea agreement in this case and the elements of the crimes, the Panel finds that Dr. Maroof acted "contrary to the accepted and customary rule of right and duty" that she owes to her fellow citizens in the State of Maryland and that her conduct was base, vile, and shameful. *Walman*, 280 Md. at 459. Dr. Maroof's conduct included, but was not limited to, prescribing combinations of Alprazolam, Amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and Buprenorphine to patients in a manner outside the usual course of professional practice and without a legitimate medical purpose. Her actions "negatively impact 'public confidence' in the medical profession and cast an 'unsavory . . . shadow' over the field." *Burke*, 250 Md. App. at 353. The Panel finds that Dr. Maroof's conduct falls squarely within the Court's definition of a crime involving moral turpitude.

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 revoke the license if appellate proceedings are no longer pending.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Based on the above discussion, Panel A concludes that Dr. Marroof's guilty plea to Count One of the Indictment, which charged her with Distribution and Dispensing of Alprazolam, Amphetamine-dextroamphetamine, and Buprenorphine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), is a crime involving moral turpitude. As a result, Health Occ. § 14-404(b)(2) requires Panel A to order the revocation of Dr. Marroof's license.

ORDER

It is, by Panel A, hereby:

ORDERED that the license of Anissa Marroof, M.D., license number D70991, 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).

05/15/2026
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. Maroof 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. Maroof 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:

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