

**IN THE MATTER OF
LAURIE DAY, LCSW-C
RESPONDENT**

License Number: 03017

* **BEFORE THE MARYLAND
STATE BOARD OF
SOCIAL WORK EXAMINERS**
* **Case Number: 2024-3640**
*

Received
2025
Maryland Board of
Social Work Examiners

CONSENT ORDER

On November 19, 2025, the Maryland State Board of Social Work Examiners (the “Board”) charged **Laurie Day, LCSW-C** (“Licensed Certified Social Worker - Clinical”) (the “Respondent”), License Number 03017, with violating the Maryland Social Workers Practice Act (the “Act”) codified at Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. §§ 19-101 *et seq.* (2021 Repl. Vol. and 2024 Supp.).

The Board based its actions on the following provisions of the Act:

§ 19-311. 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: ...

- (4) Commits any act of gross negligence, incompetence, or misconduct in the practice of social work;
- (5) Engages in a course of conduct that is inconsistent with generally accepted professional standards in the practice of social work;
- (6) Violates any provision of this title or regulations governing the practice of social work adopted and published by the Board;

(20) Fails to maintain adequate patient records[.]

10.42.03.03. Code of Maryland Regulations - Responsibilities to Clients.

A. The licensee shall:

(5) Maintain documentation in the client's record which:

(a) Is legible;

(b) Accurately reflects the services provided, including treatment plans, treatment goals, and contact notes;

(c) Indicates the time and date the services were provided;

(d) Protects the client's privacy by including only information directly relevant to the delivery of services;

(e) Is sufficient and timely to facilitate the delivery and continuity of future services;

(f) Is reasonably accessible for the period required in Health General Article, § 4-403, Annotated Code of Maryland, after termination of services; and

(g) Ensures that no confidential information is disseminated and identities are protected when using technology to communicate or access client information.

10.42.03.05. Code of Maryland Regulations - Relationships.

A. The licensee may not enter into a dual relationship with a client or an individual with whom the client has a close personal relationship.

B. Adoption of a Former Client. The Board may make an exception to § A of this regulation in the case of a licensee seeking the adoption of a former client under what is deemed extraordinary circumstances as a result of a Board investigation.

C. The licensee may enter into a nonsexual relationship with an individual with whom the licensee's prior professional contact:

(1) Was of a brief, peripheral, or indirect nature; and

(2) Did not constitute a therapeutic relationship.

On January 21, 2026 , the parties appeared at a Case Resolution Conference (“CRC”) before a committee of the Board. The Respondent and the Administrative

Prosecutor assigned to the case participated in the CRC. As a result of the negotiations at the CRC, the parties agreed to the following Consent Order consisting of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board finds the following:

1. At all relevant times, the Respondent was licensed to practice clinical social work in the State of Maryland. The Respondent initially was licensed as a licensed certified social worker-clinical (“LCSW-C”) in Maryland on or about June 30, 1980 under license number 03017. The Respondent’s license expires on October 31, 2027.

2. At all relevant times, the Respondent worked as a LCSW-C.

a. Complaint

3. On or about November 15, 2024, the Board received a written Complaint (the “Complaint”) from a Montgomery County government employee (the “Complainant”) alleging that the Respondent had been taking advantage of a client (the “Client”) with declining mental capacity over a twenty (20) plus year period of treatment. The Complainant alleged the Respondent generated a dependency with the Client and used that dependency to take advantage of the Client and isolate her from her family.

4. Based on the Complaint, the Board opened an investigation.

b. Investigation

5. In furtherance of its investigation, the Board in part obtained a written statement from the Respondent, and conducted under oath interviews with the Respondent, the Complainant, the Client’s adult son (the “Son”), and a friend of the

Client (the “Friend”) who also is a licensed Maryland social worker. The Board subpoenaed but did not obtain treatment records of the Client from the Respondent.

i) Interview of the Complainant

6. On May 27, 2025, a Board investigator interviewed the Complainant. During the interview, the Complainant stated she was employed as an investigator with a Montgomery County government agency. In that capacity, the Complainant conducted an investigation after receiving information from the Friend of the Client that the Respondent had “inappropriate boundaries” with the Client. The Friend was a colleague of the Complainant and has been acquainted personally with the Client for 15 years.

7. The Complainant recounted that she visited the Client on two occasions. At the time, the Client was a resident of a skilled nursing facility (the “Facility”) in Montgomery County, Maryland. During the first visit, the Client stated she has been in therapy with the Respondent since the late 1990s. The Client stated over this time frame she spent approximately \$1,000 each month for therapy sessions with the Respondent. The Client “reported feeling very attached to the therapist [the Respondent] and also very grateful to the therapist as she’s helped her process her past trauma, including trauma in previous lives and has supported her through various life changes.”

8. At this first visit, the Complainant conducted a cognitive assessment of the Client that indicated “she does have cognitive limitations.”

9. At the first visit, the Complainant also spoke to staff of the Facility who stated the Respondent had encouraged the Client not to stay at the Facility.

10. The Complainant also stated she spoke with the Client's adult Son. The Complainant reported that the Son "felt that the client had been manipulated by the therapist for the past 30 – 25 to 30 years. . . . He feels the client is emotionally dependent on the therapist[.]"

11. At her second visit, the Complainant stated the Client denied having any therapy sessions with the Respondent at the Facility. However, a social worker at the Facility stated that the Client received therapy with the Respondent at some point.

12. The Client did admit to paying the Respondent for therapy sessions with money orders. These money orders were \$1,000 per month and the Respondent did not take insurance. The Client's total monthly income was approximately \$2,000 a month.

13. The Complainant also spoke with the Respondent. The Respondent "said that she had been providing two sessions per week to the client and charging \$1,000 per month. . . . She stated the reason the client paid her in money orders is the fact the client had wanted to keep the fact that she was paying as much as she had for therapy private from her children." The Respondent also stated to the Complainant that "she is still in contact with the client and feels she's not providing therapy per se, but she will check in with her as she can provide the client with emotional support because her family are not involved." The Respondent "feels this is the right thing to do given the fact that the client has few supports and given that she's had a longstanding relationship with the client."

14. The Respondent also stated to the Complainant that "her engagement with [the Facility] has been minimal, but she did advocate for a change of roommate." The Respondent also is listed as the "family contact" at the Facility.

ii) Interview of the Son

15. On June 16, 2025, a Board Investigator interviewed the Son. The Son stated his mother, the Client, has been working with the Respondent “for close to 30 years.” The Son stated his mother initially “was very open about the fact that she was seeing Laurie, who she described as a past life therapist.”

16. Subsequently, the Son stated his mother “did not discuss her at all with any of us,” although he “knew that she continued to work with [the Respondent] over the years.” The Son stated it “wasn’t until my mother’s significant health event over the past year starting...in April of last year that we really kind of understood the extent to which Ms. Day was...I mean how should I say it? A very concerning amount of control and influence over my mother in every...way, shape or form.”

iii) Interview of the Friend

17. On June 23, 2025, a Board investigator interviewed the Friend. The Friend is a geriatric clinical social worker and has been a personal friend of the Client for 15 years.

18. The Friend recounted that the Client became “quite ill in the summer of 2024, and up until that point, the Client had not “really shared a lot about her psychotherapy.” The Friend stated the Client was hospitalized with COVID, could not understand all of the medical information, and offered to contact her children. The Client stated to her that “she did not have contact with any of her children, that she was estranged because they were all abusive.” The Client told the Friend to call the

Respondent, who the Client said, “was her therapist, that she had been working with for many, many years.”

19. After the Friend helped the Client get admitted to the Facility following her discharge from the hospital, the Friend telephoned the Respondent at the Client’s insistence. During that conversation, the Friend reported that with the Client’s permission she informed the Respondent “about her medical status and what she was in rehab for and how long it would take to see if she could possibly get back into any level of independent living. [The Client] was in her early 80s at that point and quite weak.” The Friend recounted in “that conversation, [she] was extremely alarmed because Ms. Day kept saying we have to get her out of there. She’s going to die. They’re going to kill her. They’re giving her antidepressants, and those are poison. She was trying to enlist my aid....And then she started going on, giving me some of the history she had with [the Client], that she had been working with her for many, many years, that she helped her escape, get away from her toxic family....And then [the Respondent] told me [the Client’s] lung problem, and [the Client] at this point was on oxygen 24/7, was caused by a doctor giving her a too strong antibiotic. We just have to get her out of that place, and she will be fine.”

20. After this initial phone call, the Friend stated the Respondent “called me something like seven or eight times over the course of the next couple of weeks. She was leaving me voicemails...all these urgent....You’ve got to help.”

21. Over the next several months, the Friend continued to visit the Client at the Facility. During this time frame, the Client disclosed that the Respondent “is a past-life

therapist,” and started working with her in the 1990s after seeing an advertisement in a newspaper. The Client also stated “that from the very first visit, [the Respondent] told her she had to pay in cash, that there was no billing.”

22. In September 2024, the Friend stated that it became evident that the Client would not be discharged from the Facility and would need to apply for Medicaid to pay for her long-term care. To that end, the Facility and Medicaid required receipts from the Respondent to document that the monetary payments to the Respondent were for therapy. The Friend recalls a discussion with the Respondent in which she explained to Ms. Day that “a Medicaid application is in process” and the Client “has to account for all of the cash withdrawals that have been made over – they look back five years....So can you provide some receipts and some documentation of the work you’ve done with her? And she said verbatim, no, absolutely not, and there is no paper trail that can link me to [the Client.]”

23. During the Medicaid application process, a social worker at the Facility told the Friend it was very important that the Client understand she cannot “dissipate any of her assets,” including to the Respondent. The Friend recalled that the Client kept stating that she owed the Respondent money.

24. The Friend stated “people from our church community were contacting me saying, I know you’re [the Client’s] friend. I know you’re visiting her regularly. I’m getting phone calls that she wants to borrow \$2,000 in cash so she can pay her therapist.” After receiving this information, the Friend stated she had a conference call with the Respondent and the Client. During that telephone conversation, the Friend

informed the Respondent that “the application for Medicaid has been filed. From this point forward, no assets can be dissipated. No checks can be written. Nothing can be disposed of that can be categorized as [the Client’s] assets. In that phone conversation [the Client] said, Laurie, how much do I still owe you? I want to pay you. And Laurie said, you still owe me \$2,000, [Client]. And then she said, you could sell your car. That must be worth something. This was exactly after I said to both of them, you cannot dissipate any of your assets from this point forward.”

25. During this conversation, the Friend stated that the Client mentioned she had a few thousand dollars in an account. The Friend reminded her that the Facility wanted her to use her assets to prepay for funeral expenses. The Friend recalled the Respondent told the Client, “don't do that, don't put \$2,000 in one of those accounts. They're ripping you off. I can get you a cremation contract for a lot less than that, to which I said, Laurie, you are in Oregon. [The Client] is here in the state of Maryland.

iv) Interview of the Respondent

26. On May 22, 2025, a Board Investigator interviewed the Respondent. The Respondent describes herself as an “LCSW clinical psychotherapist.”

27. The Respondent recalled that she started treating the Client in Maryland at least 25 years ago. The Respondent disclosed that 20 years, she moved to Oregon. She describes her relationship with the Client as “totally therapeutic.” Since her move to Oregon, the Respondent’s therapy is conducted “over the phone.”

28. The Respondent stated, “I really care for [the Client.]” The Respondent stated “it’s an unusual relationship for me because most of my clients I’m able to work with, they stay with me. They like my work. And they stay for a year or two, but they

leave, you know. They're in good shape. They leave and all. But [the Client's] life has been one crisis after another."

29. Over the years, the Respondent claims because of the Client's estrangement from her children, and the children not offering her a place to stay or stepping in with money, "basically, it's been on me. I've helped her get three different homes of friends in her area....And it was on me in our relationship to help her develop herself that she could make a living. And we came up with the idea of companion care."

30. The Respondent admitted that over the course of their 25 year therapeutic relationship, she has charged the Client \$1,000 a month even though the Client's total monthly income was approximately \$2,000 a month. "I was seeing her twice a week, 125 dollars, so that's 250 plus, you know, four weeks, about 1000 – yeah, I was spending many more hours at times, because she was in a lot of crisis at times." The Respondent stated the Client "would send me the money order for 1,000 dollars....We kept it as a money order because we wanted to keep it confidential from her children, and that was the only way we thought maybe, you know, that she could keep therapy confidential, but it all came out with the Medicaid investigation[.]"

31. Since the Client has been admitted to the Facility, the Respondent admitted "I'm very involved with her. You know, I'm trying to get her into a better room." The Respondent also admitted to sending the Client puzzle books, and discussing with Facility staff purchasing books for her. The Respondent stated, "I'm just watching over every aspect, you know."

32. The Respondent claims she no longer treats the Client in a professional capacity since her admission to the Facility. However, the Respondent stated she still has regular “pro bono” phone sessions with the Client.

33. The Respondent denied every practicing past lives therapy with the Client. However, in online promotional materials, the Respondent states her “abilities have evolved through years of studying alternative healing methods; such as Past Lives Therapy[.]”

v) Subpoenas

34. On May 29, 2025, a Board Investigator issued a subpoena to the Respondent to produce all treatment records, treatment notes, type of treatment used, supervisory notes, supervisory contract, and any additional documents pertaining to her treatment of the Client. The Respondent did not produce any such records despite being in a therapeutic relationship with the Client for over 25 years.

35. Rather, the Respondent sent an email to a Board investigator on June 3, 2025 stating she is “able to give you the dates and notes of my psychotherapy sessions with [the Client] over the last 5 years or so. When I moved here, my previous records were lost during the move.” The two page email contained headings entitled “History,” “Treatment Plan,” and “Notes.”

36. An email dated June 2, 2025 from the Respondent to a Board investigator contained dates of 192 claimed therapy sessions for 2022 and 2023 with the Client. No therapy notes or other documentation were provided with the email.

37. An email dated June 3, 2025 from the Respondent to a Board investigator contained dates of 192 claimed therapy session for 2020 and 2021 with the Client. No therapy notes or other documentation were provided with the email.

38. An email dated June 5, 2025 from the Respondent to a Board investigator contained dates of 138 claimed therapy sessions for 2024 and 2025 with the Client. No therapy notes or other documentation were provided with the email. This email states the Client “paid me until May 23, 2024. From then on, I have seen her for therapy, ‘pro bono.’”

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board concludes as a matter of law that the Respondent violated Health Occ. § 19-311(4)(commits any act of gross negligence, incompetence, or misconduct in the practice of social work); § 19-311(5)(engages in a course of conduct that is inconsistent with generally accepted professional standards in the practice of social work); § 19-311(6) (violates any provision of this title or regulations governing the practice of social work adopted and published by the Board); and § 19-311(20) (fails to maintain adequate patient records).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is on this 16th day of April, 2026, by a majority of the quorum of the Board considering this case hereby:

ORDERED that the Respondent be and hereby is **REPRIMANDED**; and it is further

ORDERED that the Respondent shall be placed on **PROBATION** for a minimum period of **ONE (1) YEAR** subject to the following terms and conditions:

- i. Within six (6) months of the date of this Consent Order, the Respondent shall successfully complete one Board-approved course on professional boundaries and one Board-approved course on record keeping. The Respondent shall be responsible for submitting written documentation to the Board of her successful completion of these courses. The Respondent understands and agrees that she may not use this coursework to fulfill any requirements mandated for licensure renewal. The Respondent shall be solely responsible for furnishing the Board with adequate written verification that she has completed the courses according to the terms set forth herein.
- ii. The Respondent shall pay a fine in the amount of **Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000)** payable to the Maryland Board of Social Work Examiners over the course of probation by the Respondent.
- iii. The Respondent is subject to chart reviews by the Board, beginning on the date this Consent Order becomes effective. The Board, at its discretion, may conduct chart review to ensure the Respondent is in compliance with the Act.
- iv. The Respondent shall comply with the Maryland Social Workers Act and all laws, statutes and regulations pertaining thereto.

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that after the conclusion of **ONE (1) YEAR** from the date of this Consent Order, the Respondent may submit a written petition to the Board requesting termination of probation. After consideration of the petition, the probation may be terminated, through an order of the Board, or a designated Board committee. The Board, or designated Board committee, may grant the termination if the Respondent has fully and satisfactorily complied with all of the probationary terms and conditions and there are no pending investigation or outstanding complaints of similar violations against her; and it is further

ORDERED that if the Board has reason to believe that the Respondent has failed to comply with any term or condition of probation or this Consent Order, the Respondent shall be given notice and an opportunity for a hearing. If there is a genuine dispute as to a material fact, the

hearing shall be an evidentiary hearing before the Board. If there is no genuine dispute as to a material fact, the Respondent shall be given a show cause hearing before the Board; and it is further

ORDERED that after the appropriate hearing, if the Board determines that the Respondent has failed to comply with any term or condition imposed by this Consent Order, the Board may reprimand the Respondent, place the Respondent on probation with appropriate terms and conditions, or suspend or revoke the Respondent's license to practice social work in Maryland. The Board may, in addition to one or more of the sanctions set forth above, impose a civil monetary fine on the Respondent; and it is further

ORDERED that the Respondent shall not serve or continue to serve as: a Board authorized sponsor, presenter and/or trainer of social work continuing education learning activities, an ethics tutor, an evaluator for the Board, or a Board-approved supervisor for a period of five (5) years from the effective date of this Consent Order; and it is further

ORDERED that the Respondent is responsible for all costs incurred in fulfilling the terms and conditions of this Consent Order; and it is further

ORDERED that this Consent Order is a public document. *See Md. Code Ann., Gen. Prov. § 4-101 et seq. (2021 Repl. Vol. and 2025 Supp.)* and is reportable to any entity to whom the Board is obligated to report.¹

8/16/2026

Date

 Kevin Meenan LCSW-C

Kevin Meenan, LCSW-C, Board Chair
Maryland Board of Social Work Examiners

¹ This includes the Board's public website and NPDB.

CONSENT

I, Laurie Day, LCSW-C, License No. 03017, by affixing my signature hereto, acknowledge that:

1. I have had the opportunity to consult with counsel before signing this document.
I have knowingly and voluntarily agreed to enter into this Consent Order. By this Consent and for the purpose of resolving the issues raised by the Board, I agree and accept to be bound by the foregoing Consent Order and its conditions.
2. I am aware that I am entitled to a formal evidentiary hearing, pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 19-312 (2021 Repl. Vol. and 2025 Supp.) and Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 *et seq.* (2021 Repl. Vol. and 2025 Supp.).
3. I acknowledge the validity and enforceability of this Consent Order as if entered into after the conclusion of a formal evidentiary hearing in which I would have the right to counsel, to confront witnesses, to give testimony, to call witnesses on my own behalf, and to all other substantive and procedural protections as provided by law. I am waiving those procedural and substantive protections.
4. I voluntarily enter into and agree to abide by the terms and conditions set forth herein as a resolution of the Charges against me. I waive any right to contest the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and I waive my right to a full evidentiary hearing, as set forth above, and any right to appeal this Consent Order or any adverse ruling of the Board that might have followed any such hearing.

5. I acknowledge that by failing to abide by the conditions set forth in this Consent Order, I may be subject to disciplinary actions, which may include revocation of my license to practice as a social worker.
6. I sign this Consent Order voluntarily, without reservation, and I fully understand and comprehend the language, meaning and terms of this Consent Order.

4/8/26
Date

Laurie Day LCSW-C
Laurie Day, LCSW-C

NOTARY

STATE OF Oregon

CITY/COUNTY OF Portland | Multnomah

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that on this 8th day of April, 2026, before me, a Notary Public of the State and City/County aforesaid, personally appeared Laurie Day, LCSW-C, License Number: 03017, and gave oath in due form of law that the foregoing Consent Order was his voluntary act and deed.

AS WITNESS, my hand and Notary Seal.

Lori Ann Osbrink
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: March 19, 2027

