

IN THE MATTER OF	*	BEFORE THE
MICHAEL BOWMAN, LCSW-C	*	STATE BOARD
License No. 08986	*	OF
Respondent	*	SOCIAL WORK EXAMINERS
	*	Case No. 2014-2012

* * * * *

**FINAL ORDER OF REVOCATION OF
LICENSED CERTIFIED SOCIAL WORKER-CLINICAL LICENSE**

On October 9, 2015, and, pursuant to Md. State Govt. (SG) Code Ann. § 10-226 (c) (1) (2014 Repl. Vol. II), and the Maryland Social Work Act (the "Act"), codified at Md. Health Occ. (HO) Code Ann. §§ 19-101 *et seq.* (2014 Repl. Vol. II), the State Board of Social Work Examiners (the "Board") notified **MICHAEL BOWMAN**, Licensed Certified Social Worker-Clinical (LCSW-C), (the "Respondent") of the Board's intent to **REVOKE** the Respondent's LCSW-C license.

The pertinent provision of § 10-226(c) (1) of SG states:

(c) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, a unit may not revoke or suspend a license unless the unit first gives the licensee:

- (i) written notice of the facts that warrant suspension or revocation; and
- (ii) an opportunity to be heard.

The pertinent provision of § 19-311 of the Act states:

Denials, reprimands, suspensions, and revocations -- Grounds Subject to the hearing provisions of § 19-312 of this subtitle, the Board may deny a license to any applicant, fine a licensee, reprimand any licensee, place any licensee on probation, or suspend or revoke a license if the applicant or licensee:

- (7) Is convicted of or pleads guilty or nolo contendere to a felony or to a crime involving moral turpitude, whether or not any appeal or other proceeding is pending to have the conviction or plea set

aside[;].

**FACTS THAT WARRANT
THE REVOCATION OF THE RESPONDENT'S LICENCE**

1. At all times relevant hereto, the Respondent was licensed to practice clinical social work in Maryland. The Respondent's license was first issued on September 13, 1996. The Respondent's license expired on October 31, 2014.¹

2. On or about October 6, 2014, the Board received an email from Social Worker A² containing an article about the Respondent's conviction for fraud. The Board began an investigation, which disclosed information set forth below:

3. At all times relevant hereto, the Respondent served as a Supervisor for the Baltimore City Department of Social Services. In that capacity, the Respondent's email was flagged in September 2011 for suspicious activity.

4. That email contained an attachment which listed numerous names, bank account numbers, and other personal identifying information.

5. As a result of the above, a multi-agency investigation unfolded, which disclosed the following:

A. The Respondent admitted to law enforcement that he was lonely and had sought companionship online;

B. The Respondent stated that he met a man named "Steve" on a networking site in October 2010, who claimed to live in London;

C. "Steve" promised to move to Baltimore with the Respondent if the

¹On January 4, 2013, the Board sent the Respondent a non-public Letter of Admonishment based upon his failure to renew his license by October 31, 2012 and practicing after that date. The Respondent's license was reinstated on November 27, 2013, but between the expiration and reinstatement, he practiced social work and used the title of clinical social worker. This violation can be considered as part of the Board's decision in weighing what weight it will give the discipline based upon the Respondent's present violation of the Act.

Respondent helped provide him with money, including funds to purportedly repair a house that Steve's father left him upon his father's death;

D. During the fraud scheme, which extended from October 2010 to September 2011, "Steve" also introduced the Respondent to his friend "David". The Respondent never met "Steve" or "David" in person;

E. The Respondent was sent account numbers and personal identifying information of bank account holders which the Respondent used to impersonate the individual victims. Once the Respondent had gained access to the individual victims' accounts, the Respondent obtained account balance information allowing the co-conspirators to link the individual victims' account to accounts the Respondent opened at banks;

F. The co-conspirators then initiated wire transfers from the victims' accounts, through the Respondent's accounts to third party accounts controlled by "Steve", "David" and others;

G. Over the course of the fraud scheme, the Respondent accessed at least 88 individual accounts, resulting in an intended loss totaling \$5,000, and an actual loss of over \$35,000;

H. The Respondent also wired approximately \$10,000 of his own money to "Steve" and "David" in small increments. He also participated in a scheme to traffic in counterfeit MoneyGram money orders, whereby the Respondent purchased a \$1 MoneyGram money order at a grocery store, scanned it, and emailed the scanned image to "David". The Respondent then received approximately 100 forged MoneyGram money orders in the mail, all in

²The name of any individuals is confidential.

the amount of \$997. At "David's" request, the Respondent mailed some of those money orders to a co-conspirator. MoneyGram suffered no actual loss from the scheme.

6. On or about October 18, 2013 in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, the Respondent pled guilty to Wire Fraud, Aiding and Abetting. He was sentenced to the Federal Bureau of Prisons for 33 months. After the Respondent serves his prison term, he will be on supervised release for three years and must comply with various conditions. The Court further stated that, as a condition of supervised release, the Respondent was "forbidden" from working as a licensed social worker. The Respondent was also ordered to pay a \$100 court assessment and \$35,283.70 restitution.

7. As set forth above, pleading guilty to a felony and to a crime of moral turpitude is a violation of § 19-311(7) of the Act.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the foregoing Facts, the Board concludes that the Respondent violated to §19-311(7) its Act and that the revocation is warranted.

ORDER

As set forth above, the Board hereby Orders that the license to practice Licensed Certified Social Work-Clinical in Maryland held by **MICHAEL BOWMAN**, the Respondent, be and is **REVOKED**, and that this Order is public, pursuant to Md. Code Ann. General Provisions §§4-101 *et seq.* (2014 Vol.).

NOTICE OF RIGHT OF APPEAL

In accordance with § 19-313 of the Act and S.G. §§ 10-201, *et seq.* (2014 Repl. Vol. II) you have a right to a direct judicial appeal of this decision. A petition for appeal of the Final Board Order shall be filed within thirty days from your receipt of this Final Order and shall be made in accordance with the *aforecited* authority.

12.11.15

Date



Mark Lannon, LCSW-C, Chair
State Board of Social Work Examiners