

**IN THE MATTER OF**  
**MICHELLE BAHRAIN, D.O.**  
**Respondent**  
**License Number: H57147**

**BEFORE THE**  
**MARYLAND STATE**  
**BOARD OF PHYSICIANS**  
**Case Number: 2225-0112A**

---

**FINAL DECISION AND ORDER**

On February 28, 2025, Disciplinary Panel A of the Maryland State Board of Physicians (the “Board”) issued charges against Michelle Bahrain, D.O. (“Respondent”), alleging violations of the Maryland Medical Practice Act. *See* Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. §§ 14-401—14-702. Specifically, the Respondent was charged with violating the following provisions of the Act:

**Health Occ. § 14-404**

(a) Subject to the hearing provisions of § 14-405 of this subtitle, a disciplinary panel, on the affirmative vote of a majority of the quorum of the disciplinary panel, may reprimand any licensee, place any licensee on probation, or suspend or revoke a license if the licensee:

....

(3) Is guilty of:

....

(ii) Unprofessional conduct in the practice of medicine; [and]

(4) Is professionally, physically, or mentally incompetent[.]

The case was delegated to the Office of Administrative Hearings (“OAH”) for an evidentiary hearing. An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) from OAH held an evidentiary hearing on September 9, 11, 12, 15, and 17, and October 28 and 29, 2025. Administrative Prosecutors from the Office of the Attorney General, Health Occupations and Litigation Unit (“HOPL”), represented the State. The Respondent was represented by legal counsel.

On January 27, 2026, the ALJ issued a proposed decision. The ALJ concluded that the Respondent was guilty of unprofessional conduct in the practice of medicine, in violation of Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(3)(ii), and recommended that the charge of professional, physical, or mental incompetence, under Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4), be dismissed. As a sanction, the ALJ proposed that the Respondent be reprimanded.

The State filed exceptions to the ALJ's proposed dismissal of the Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4) charge and to the proposed sanction.

On March 25, 2026, Board Disciplinary Panel B ("Panel B" or the "Panel") held an exceptions hearing. Administrative Prosecutors from the Office of the Attorney General, HOPL, represented the State. The Respondent appeared and was represented by legal counsel.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Panel B finds that the following facts were proved by the preponderance of evidence:

1. The Respondent was issued Maryland medical license No. H57147 on February 27, 2001, and held that license in good standing until it was summarily suspended on February 26, 2025. The summary suspension was affirmed on March 12, 2025.
2. The Respondent was employed as an infectious-disease specialist at a medical center ("Hospital"),<sup>1</sup> in Maryland, from August 2004 until her resignation effective September 11, 2024.
3. In 2018, approximately, during the course of her employment at the Hospital, the Respondent became professionally acquainted with Individual 1, another physician employed at the Hospital.

---

<sup>1</sup> In order to maintain privacy of those involved to the extent possible, this decision uses generic terms for facilities, organizations, and individuals.

4. Over the course of several years, the Respondent developed an emotional attachment to Individual 1, frequently communicating, for personal reasons, by telephone, text message, and through the workplace email and messaging system.

5. After previously requesting that the Respondent reduce the number of text messages, Individual 1, in 2023, requested that the Respondent cease all communications with him.

6. After Individual 1 filed a complaint with the Hospital's Human Resources regarding the Respondent's unwanted communications, the Hospital suspended the Respondent pending an investigation into workplace harassment, on November 21, 2023.

7. On December 6, 2023, the Hospital notified the Respondent that it substantiated that the Respondent harassed a coworker, Individual 1, in communicating with him despite being requested to cease non-business communications.

8. In December 2023, the Respondent took a leave of absence from the Hospital and, in February 2024, returned to work.

9. On January 19, 2024, the Hospital issued a Letter of Expectations, instructing the Respondent to have no further contact with Individual 1. The Letter of Expectations also provided clear guidance on communicating with Individual 1 if a consultation for a Hospital patient were needed. On January 22, 2024, the Respondent acknowledged receipt of the Letter of Expectations.

10. On September 8, 2024, Individual 1 contacted the Hospital's Human Resources, providing documentation that the Respondent contacted him in violation of the Letter of Expectations.

12. On September 9, 2024, the Hospital informed the Respondent that she was suspended pending an investigation for violating the terms of the Letter of Expectations and directly contacting Individual 1.

13. On September 11, 2024, the Respondent resigned from the Hospital.

14. On October 10, 2024, the Hospital provided the Board with a Mandated 10-Day Report, indicating that the Respondent resigned her employment “during an investigation of workplace harassment concerning [the Respondent’s] conduct towards another employee.”

15. The Board opened a disciplinary investigation based on the Mandated 10-Day Report.

16. An evaluation of the Respondent was conducted between November 30 and December 4, 2024, and a report of this evaluation was issued.

17. An assessment of the Respondent, which was initiated on January 6, 2025, was conducted, and the assessment report was issued on July 31, 2025.

18. Another report of the Respondent was issued on July 24, 2025, which was primarily based upon the report of the November 30 – December 4, 2024 evaluation.

## **DISCUSSION**

The ALJ issued proposed conclusions of law that the State met its burden to prove that the Respondent was guilty of unprofessional conduct in the practice of medicine, in violation of Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(3)(ii). But the ALJ also concluded that the evidence was insufficient to prove that the Respondent was physically, professionally, or mentally incompetent, under Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4).

No exceptions were taken concerning the ALJ's proposed conclusion that Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(3)(ii) was proved. The State filed exceptions to the ALJ's proposed conclusion that the Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4) charge was not proved.

*Unprofessional Conduct*

The Respondent acknowledged in her testimony that she acted unprofessionally by continuing to contact Individual 1 after Individual 1 had asked her not to. On January 19, 2024, the Hospital issued a Letter of Expectations to the Respondent that required her to refrain from further contacting Individual 1, with the exception that the Respondent could contact Individual 1 indirectly through an intermediary if a medical consultation were necessary. The Respondent violated the Letter of Expectations by directly contacting Individual 1. Subsequently the Respondent resigned from the Hospital while under investigation by the Hospital. Panel B adopts the ALJ's findings and conclusion concerning Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(3)(ii), and thus Panel B concludes that the Respondent is guilty of unprofessional conduct in the practice of medicine, in violation of Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(3)(ii).

*Charge of Professional, Physical, or Mental Incompetence*

The ALJ found that the Respondent was not professionally, physically, or mentally incompetent under Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4). The ALJ focused on the testimony of two expert witnesses who testified at the evidentiary hearing (one expert's testimony supported the State's position and the other's testimony supported the Respondent) and the three reports.<sup>2</sup> The ALJ found the evidence favorable to the Respondent more persuasive than the evidence supporting the State's position. The ALJ also found that the assessment favorable to the Respondent, which took

---

<sup>2</sup> (1) Report of the November 30 to December 4, 2024, evaluation, (2) the July 31, 2025, report of the January/February 2025 assessment, and (3) the July 24, 2025, report that was premised on the November/December 2024 evaluation.

place in January and February 2025, was sufficiently close in time to the November 30 to December 4, 2024, evaluation, which was unfavorable to the Respondent, so that the different times of the evaluations were not the cause of the differing opinions.

The State took exception to the ALJ's finding that the Respondent was not professionally, physically, or mentally incompetent. The State argued that the ALJ erred, contending that the January/February 2025 assessment does not conflict with the November/December 2024 evaluation. The State argued that the Respondent was unfit to practice during the November/December 2024 evaluation period, and the State does not dispute that the Respondent was competent in January/February 2025. The Panel accepts that one could be incompetent under Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4) for a certain time period and be competent during another time period, however, the Panel does not find that the evidence in this case was sufficient to show incompetency during the November/December 2024 period. The Panel is not convinced that the Respondent's condition changed to such an extent over the course of these periods to find that she was incompetent from November 30 to December 4, 2024, and competent in January/February 2025. The Panel does not accept that the difference in opinions was the result of a difference in the Respondent's condition. Instead, the Panel finds that the January/February 2025 assessment and testimony supporting this assessment more persuasive than the November/December 2024 evaluation and reports and testimony supporting that evaluation.

The State also argued on exceptions that the ALJ erred by not qualifying the State's expert in a particular subject area. The ALJ did qualify this State's witness as an expert in another subject area. The Panel, however, does not find that the State's expert's testimony was restricted to any significant extent nor that the State was prejudiced by this denial.

The State's exceptions pertaining to Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4) are denied.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the findings of fact and discussion, Panel B concludes that the Respondent is guilty of unprofessional conduct in the practice of medicine, in violation of Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(3)(ii). The charge of Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4) is dismissed.

## SANCTION

The ALJ recommended that the Respondent be reprimanded. The State took exception to the ALJ's proposed sanction. The State requested that the Panel order the Respondent to enroll in the Maryland Professional Rehabilitation Program and that the suspension not be lifted until it is determined that it is safe for the Respondent to return to the practice of medicine. The Respondent disagreed with the State's proposed sanction, contending that she has demonstrated that any sanction beyond a reprimand is unnecessary. The Panel denies the State's exception.

The Panel finds that a reprimand is appropriate. The Panel is persuaded that the Respondent has taken the necessary measures and made the necessary effort to sufficiently address the concerns of the Panel regarding her conduct.

## ORDER

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

**ORDERED** that the Respondent, Michelle Bahrain, D.O., is **REPRIMANDED**; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the order for summary suspension, issued on February 26, 2025, and affirmed on March 12, 2025, concerning the Respondent's Maryland medical license is **TERMINATED** as moot, because the charges have been resolved through this Final Decision and Order; and it is further

**ORDERED** that this Final Decision and Order is a public document. See Health Occ. §§ 1-607, 14-411.1(b)(2), and Gen. Prov. § 4-333(b)(6).

06/11/2026  
Date

## *Signature on File*

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

### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW**

Pursuant to Health Occ. § 14-408, the Respondent 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 the mailing of this Final Decision and Order. The date of this Final Decision and Order is the date Final Decision and Order 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 the Respondent 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, 4th Floor  
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

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

David Wagner  
Assistant Attorney General  
Maryland Department of Health  
300 West Preston Street, Suite 302  
Baltimore, Maryland 21201