

**IN THE MATTER OF
PAUL V. BEALS, M.D.**

*** BEFORE THE
* MARYLAND STATE
* BOARD OF PHYSICIANS
* Case Number: 2225-0116**

License Number: D25922

* * * * *

ORDER OF DEFAULT

On March 4, 2025, Disciplinary Panel A of the Maryland State Board of Physicians (“Board”) issued Disciplinary Charges, under the Maryland Medical Practice Act, Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. §§ 14-101 - 14-702, to Paul V. Beals, M.D., alleging that Dr. Beals was physically, mentally, or professionally incompetent, in violation of Health Occ. §14-404(a)(4). On June 6, 2025, the case was referred to the Office of Administrative Hearings (“OAH”) for an evidentiary hearing.

On June 16, 2025, OAH mailed a Notice of Remote Scheduling Conference to each party at their address of record.¹ On June 23, 2025, the Notice was returned to the OAH marked “Moved left no address – unable to forward – return to sender.” On June 30, 2025, the OAH sent a second Notice of Remote Scheduling Conference to Dr. Beals at his home address of record on file with the Board. The Notice informed Dr. Beals that a Scheduling Conference would be held on July 22, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., by video-conference. The second scheduling conference notice was not returned as undeliverable. On July 22, 2025, 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. Dr. Beals did not appear, nor did counsel appear on his behalf.

¹ The Notice was initially sent to Dr. Beals at his business address of record on file with the Board.

During the Scheduling Conference, a prehearing conference was scheduled for September 12, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

The ALJ issued a Scheduling Order, and, on September 3, 2025, OAH sent a notice of the remote prehearing conference. OAH sent the Scheduling Order and the Notice to Dr. Beals at his home address of record, and neither was returned as undeliverable. The Notice stated that failure to attend the prehearing conference might result in a decision against the non-appearing party.

On September 12, 2025, 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 fifteen minutes after the scheduled start time, Dr. Beals did not appear and no one appeared on his behalf. Dr. Beals did not request a postponement or notify OAH of any technical issues with logging on. The State moved for a default against Dr. Beals.

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 September 18, 2025, the ALJ issued a Proposed Default Order. The ALJ found that Dr. Beals failed to appear despite having received proper notice. The ALJ proposed that the Panel find Dr. Beals in default, that the Board adopt as findings of fact the statements set forth in the allegations of fact section of the charges, and conclude, as a matter of law that Dr. Beals violated section 14-404(a)(4) of the Maryland Medical Practice Act, by being professionally, physically, or mentally incompetent. The ALJ recommended the revocation of Dr. Beals's medical license.

The ALJ mailed, by regular first-class mail, copies of the Proposed Default Order to Dr. Beals at his home address of record, the administrative prosecutor, and the Board. 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. Neither party filed exceptions. On October 29, 2025, this case came before Disciplinary Panel B (“Panel B”) of the Board for final disposition.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Because Panel B concludes that Dr. Beals 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:

I. Background

1. The Respondent was initially licensed to practice medicine in Maryland on December 19, 1980, under license number 025922.
2. The Respondent is board-certified in Family Medicine.
3. The Respondent maintains a family medicine practice in Stevensville, Maryland.

II. Respondent’s Disciplinary History

1988 Agreement

4. On June 21, 1988, the Board and the Respondent executed a non-public Disposition Agreement and Consent Order (the “1988 Agreement”). The 1988 Agreement required that the Respondent follow certain terms and conditions including limiting the use of non-traditional medical treatments. The Respondent was also prohibited from providing medical or psychiatric services to psychiatric patients and placing advertisements without Board approval. The Board also ordered peer review of the Respondent’s medical practice.

1993 Consent Order

5. On October 23, 1991, the Board charged the Respondent with violation of the 1988 Agreement. The Board’s charges occurred prior to the Respondent’s eligibility to petition for

termination of probation pursuant to the 1988 Agreement. A peer review of twenty-four (24) patients revealed that the Respondent performed inappropriate procedures, provided thyroid medication without diagnostic testing, performed cortisol testing and prescribed steroids without any medical justification, etc. The peer reviewers also noted that the Respondent's medical record documentation and record maintenance was inadequate.

6. On November 10, 1993, the Respondent entered into a Consent Order wherein his license was suspended for three (3) years. The suspension was immediately stayed and he was placed on probation for a period of three (3) years with terms and conditions including, but not limited to, the following: refrain from performing or ordering tests which were not medically indicated and provide complete disclosure (including Board approved materials) to patients who seek alternative medical treatments. The Consent Order also contained a cease-and-desist provision, required appropriate documentation in and maintenance of patient medical records, and ongoing periodic peer review.²

1996 Modified Order

7. On July 26, 1996, a Modified Consent Order (the "1996 Order") was executed granting the Respondent's request to perform chelation therapy provided that all patients sign a Board approved consent form.

1999 Modification

8. A December 21, 1998, peer review revealed that the Respondent had inappropriately used Follicle-Stimulating Hormone ("FSH") testing to assess effectiveness of plant-derived hormone replacement therapy ("HRT") and that this testing was not within the standards of care for monitoring HRT. In addition, the peer reviewers found that the Respondent overutilized FSH testing on the sixteen (16) patients whose records were reviewed.

9. On October 20, 1999, in lieu of formal charges for the violation, the Respondent entered into a Modification by Consent to the Consent Order (the "1999 Order"). The 1999 Order prohibited the Respondent from performing FSH testing in his office laboratory, required the Respondent to provide a Board-approved disclosure form to all patients for whom he prescribed plant-derived or non-prescription HRT, prohibited the Respondent from using FSH testing to test effectiveness of the HRT, mandated additional peer review or chart review by a Board designee to ascertain FSH testing ordered for patients after the effective date of the order, and probation was to continue pending successful completion of a peer review of the Respondent's practice.

2004 Consent Order

10. On April 28, 2004, the Respondent entered into a Consent Order with the Board wherein the Board found the Respondent to have violated Health Occupations §14-404(a)(4) and

² On June 5, 1995, the New Jersey State Board of Medical Examiners, in a reciprocal action, suspended the Respondent's medical license for three (3) years.

(18)³ whereby his license to practice medicine in Maryland was suspended for a period of two years, followed by probation for a minimum of five years with terms and conditions.⁴

2013 Consent Order

11. On May 22, 2013, the Respondent entered into a Consent Order wherein the Board concluded as a matter of law that the disciplinary action taken by the District of Columbia Board⁵ against the Respondent was for an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action under Health Occupations §14-404(a)(3)(ii) and (18)⁶ had those offenses been committed in the State of Maryland.

12. As a result, the Respondent's license was suspended until such time that his license was reinstated by the District of Columbia Board of Medicine (the "DC Board").

13. On February 6, 2014, the DC Board issued a Termination Order which terminated the suspension of the Respondent's license to practice medicine that was imposed by the December 18, 2012 Consent Order.

14. On February 24, 2014, pursuant to the DC Board's Termination Order, the Maryland Board terminated the Respondent's suspension.

15. On January 4, 2016, the probations imposed on the Respondent under the 1993 Consent Order and 2004 Consent Order were terminated.

III. The Complaint

16. On December 16, 2024, the Board received a complaint from a patient of the Respondent alleging that the Respondent may have a health condition that affects his ability to practice medicine safely.

³ Health Occupations §14-404(a)(4) (is professionally, physically, or mentally incompetent), and (18) (practices medicine with an unauthorized person or aids an unauthorized person in the practice of medicine).

⁴ On June 26, 2006, pursuant to the 2004 Order, the Respondent's suspension was terminated, and he was placed on probation for a period of five (5) years with certain terms and conditions.

⁵ On December 18, 2012, the District of Columbia Board of Medicine found the Respondent in violation of D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.14(a)(12)(2001) willfully practices a health occupation with an unauthorized person or aids an unauthorized person in the practice of medicine as a result of the Respondent permitting and facilitating an unlicensed individual to perform duties beyond the scope of her medical assistant designation. The Consent Order ordered that the Respondent's license to practice in DC was suspended for a period of one (1) year along with terms and conditions.

⁶ Health Occupations § 14-404(a)(3) (is guilty of: (ii) unprofessional conduct in the practice of medicine) and (18) (practices medicine with an unauthorized person or aids an unauthorized person in the practice of medicine).

17. On January 17, 2025, Board staff conducted an on-site visit at the Respondent's medical office. Board staff noted significant concerns regarding the Respondent's ability to understand the reason for their visit and his current state of mind.

18. Furthermore, family members of the Respondent were present and provided conflicting information regarding the Respondent's current practice. They also shared concerns regarding the Respondent's ability to practice.

19. Based on the information contained in the complaint and information gathered during the on-site visit, on January 22, 2025, the Board sent the Respondent a letter and an email directing the Respondent to appear at the office of the Maryland Professional Rehabilitation Program ("MPRP") on Wednesday, January 29, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. for an intake evaluation for purposes of scheduling an examination.⁷

20. The letter and email also advised the Respondent that pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occupations § 14-402(c), the unreasonable failure or refusal to submit to an examination is *prima facie* evidence of a licensed medical practitioner's inability to practice medicine, unless the Board finds that the failure or refusal was beyond the control of the individual.

21. On January 22, 2025, the Respondent replied to the email notification acknowledging receipt of the communication and asking who to contact at MPRP.

22. On January 27, 2025, the Board again advised the Respondent via email of the requirement to present himself for the intake appointment with MPRP on January 29, 2025.

23. On January 29, 2025, the Respondent informed the Board that he was unable to attend the intake appointment with the Program due to a recent injury. The intake appointment was rescheduled to February 3, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

24. On February 3, 2025, the Board sent the Respondent an email advising him that he was still required to attend the intake appointment with MPRP at 10:00 a.m.

25. On February 3, 2025, the Respondent failed to appear for the rescheduled appointment.

26. On February 21, 2025, the Board notified the Respondent via email and letter sent via overnight delivery that he had one final opportunity to appear for an appointment with MPRP which was scheduled for February 26, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

27. The letter and email, again, notified the Respondent that pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occupations § 14-402(c), the unreasonable failure or refusal to submit to an examination is *prima facie* evidence of a licensed medical practitioner's inability to practice medicine, unless the Board finds that the failure or refusal was beyond the control of the individual.

⁷ The Maryland Medical Practice Act (the "Act"), Md. Code Ann. Health Occupations § 14-402(a), authorizes the Board to direct any licensed physician regulated by the Board to submit to an appropriate evaluation.

28. The Respondent did not appear for the appointment on February 26, 2025, and did not notify the Board or MPRP of any reason that he was unable to appear.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Panel B finds Dr. Beals in default based upon his failure to appear or participate at the Prehearing Conference on September 12, 2025, at OAH. *See* State Gov't § 10-210(4). Based upon the foregoing findings of fact, Panel B concludes that Dr. Beals is physically, mentally, or professionally incompetent, in violation of Health Occ. § 14-404(a)(4).

SANCTION

Based on the entirety of the findings of fact, Panel B agrees that the revocation of Dr. Beals's license to practice medicine 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 Paul V. Beals, M.D. to practice medicine 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.

12/22/2025
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. Beals 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 Dr. Beals 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**