

**IN THE MATTER OF** \* **BEFORE THE MARYLAND**  
**KENYA L. MATTOX, LMSW** \* **STATE BOARD OF SOCIAL**  
**RESPONDENT** \* **WORK EXAMINERS**  
**LICENSE NUMBER: 15847 (Expired)\*** **Case Number: 2020-2858**

\* \* \* \* \*

**FINAL ORDER**

On or about February 16, 2022, the Maryland Board of Social Work Examiners (the “Board”) formally charged **KENYA L. MATTOX, LMSW** (the “Respondent”), License Number 15847 (Expired) with violating the Maryland Social Workers Practice Act (the “Act”), Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. (“Health Occ.”) §§ 19-101 *et seq.* (2021 Repl. Vol.).

Specifically, the Board charged the Respondent with violating the following provisions of the Act and COMAR 10.44 *et seq.*:

**Health Occ. § 19-401. Practicing without a license.**

- (a) *Social Work*. – Except as otherwise provided in this title, a person may not practice, attempt to practice, or offer to practice social work in this State while representing oneself to be a social worker unless licensed by the Board.
- (b) *Clinical Social Work*. – Except as otherwise provided in this title, a person may not practice, attempt to practice, or offer to practice clinical social work in this State while representing oneself to be a social worker unless licensed by the Board as a certified social worker – clinical.

**Procedural History**

On June 22, 2022, via regular, certified mail, email and process service, the Board sent Respondent notice of the virtual hearing to be conducted on June 10, 2022 at 9:00 AM. Due to unavailability of the parties, the matter was postponed multiple times. On

October 14, 2022, via mail and email, the Board sent Respondent notice that the hearing was postponed and rescheduled to January 13, 2023 at 1:30 PM. On December 15, 2022, via email and mail, the Board sent Respondent notice that the hearing would be conducted via virtual platform. Per statutory requirements, the notice also informed the Respondent that if she wished to utilize exhibits and/or witnesses at the hearing, she must submit that information to the Board and the Prosecutor by December 29, 2022.

On January 9, 2022, the Respondent responded to the notice via email.

Respondent's email listed several objections to the charges, as well as a list of proposed witnesses. The Respondent did not clarify if the witnesses were to be used for rebuttal purposes or for her case in chief.<sup>1</sup> Respondent also failed to provide any contact information to the Board, for purposes of preparing subpoenas. Respondent's email also stated:

It is against my religious practice to hire an attorney. I am aware that bar attorneys [*sic*] have taken an oath to uphold standards that keep people in bondage, as evidenced by the current collapsing of the federal reserve note system.

I choose not to participate in the genocide.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> COMAR 10.42.04.05: (5) Absent unforeseen circumstances which would otherwise impose an extraordinary hardship on a party, witnesses or documents may not be added to the list after:

(a) the prehearing conference if scheduled; or

(b) 15 days before the hearing, if not prehearing conference is scheduled.

(6) The prohibition against adding witnesses does not apply to witnesses or documents to be used for impeachment or rebuttal purposes.

<sup>2</sup> Respondent's emails and communications reproduced exactly as received, including formatting, grammatical, and typographical errors.

On January 13 2023, a quorum of the Board held a virtual hearing on this matter. The Respondent was present. The State was represented by Administrative Prosecutor, Assistant Attorney General Michael Kao.

As a preliminary matter, Respondent refused to acknowledge her appearance as a Respondent. Rather, Respondent made an oral motion, claiming she was “here on special appearance, not general appearance. I’m here sui juris. I do not represent myself.” When the Board ask if she wished to proceed without an attorney, Respondent stated that she was “here under duress and special appearance” and that she was “not here as a respondent either.”

After deliberating and consulting with counsel, the Board denied Respondent’s request to appear as “special appearance,” as such a designation is not permitted or present in the statutes and regulations that govern Board Hearing procedure. The Board also clarified that Respondent was present as a respondent licensee, and that she could request to be represented by an attorney if she wished. Respondent responded that

The fact that we’re here is not really appropriate so just go on the record that I’m here sui juris.

It’s against my beliefs. It’s against everything I stand for to have someone represent me. You’re standing in a position of trustee over the trust account which you’re trying to get money from. We can play this game if you want to.

The Board then proceeded with the hearing, with Respondent participating in the hearing, including presenting an opening statement, cross examining State’s witnesses, and raising objections to the State’s evidence.

**SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE**

The Board accepted and admitted evidence presented by the State, which included testimony from Garcia Gilmore, Investigator, Maryland State Board of Social Work Examiners, and the Complainant. The Board also accepted and admitted the following documents into evidence:

State's Exhibits:

<b><u>EXHIBIT</u></b>	<b><u>DESCRIPTION</u></b>
1	Respondent's Licensing Profile
2	Complaint, received August 12, 2020;
3	Respondent's Personnel File from her former employer, a counseling facility ("the Facility" <sup>3</sup> )
4	Respondent's Contract for Supervision with Supervisor
5	Interview transcript of Complainant, held on January 27, 2021
6	Interview transcript with the President of the Facility, held on January 27, 2021
7	Interview transcript of Respondent, held on January 27, 2021
8	Report of Investigation, dated February 4, 2021

**State's Witnesses:**

1. Complainant
2. Garcia Gilmore, Board Investigator

---

<sup>3</sup> To ensure confidentiality, the names of individuals, hospitals, and healthcare facilities involved in this case are not disclosed in this document.

Respondent did not submit a timely list of proposed exhibits or requested witnesses to the Board. Respondent also did not attempt to enter in any exhibits into evidence at the hearing, nor did Respondent present any witnesses on her behalf.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Board finds the following:

1. The Respondent was initially licensed to practice master social work in the State of Maryland on March 17, 2010, under License Number 15847. The Respondent allowed her license to expire without filing for renewal on October 31, 2018.
2. During the times relevant to the investigation, the Respondent was authorized to practice social work in the District of Columbia, but did not have an active license to practice by endorsement in the state of Maryland.
3. The Respondent was employed as a Multisystem Therapy Clinical Supervisor (“MST Supervisor”) at a counseling facility (the “Facility”) located in Largo, Maryland, from approximately April 13, 2020, to August 8, 2020.
4. On or about August 12, 2020, the Board received a complaint from one of the Respondent’s supervisees (the “Complainant”) at the Facility alleging that the Respondent provided clinical supervision to the Complainant and other supervisees at the Facility even though the Respondent did not have a valid license with the Board.
5. On December 15, 2020, the Board sent a subpoena to Respondent’s former employer, requesting legible copy of Respondent’s personnel file and also interviewed

relevant witnesses, including staff members at the Facility, the Complainant, and the Respondent.

6. The Respondent's personnel file revealed that Respondent's position required her to maintain licensure under the Maryland Board of Social Work and to be eligible for supervision by a Board-approved LCSW-C.

7. Respondent's personnel file also included Respondent's job responsibilities, which included:

- (a) "Carry clinical and administrative supervisory responsibilities for 1-2 MST teams of 2-4 therapists each"
- (b) "Conduct weekly group supervision and training for MST team to assure adherence to MST principles and the MST analytic process, and to assure clinician competency in implementation of interventions"
- (c) "Conduct individual supervision as needed to target clinician competency needs and to remove individual barriers to effective implementation of MST treatment."

8. On or about January 28, 2021, a Board investigator conducted an under-oath interview of the President of the Facility. During the interview, the President of the Facility confirmed that he hired the Respondent to serve as MST Supervisor for the Facility, which included performing duties as a social worker.

9. On or about January 27, 2021, a Board investigator conducted an under-oath interview of the Complainant. During the interview, the Complainant stated that

she worked as a therapists at the Facility from July 2019 to July 2020 under the Respondent's clinical supervision. The Complainant stated that in addition to providing her with clinical evaluation and treatment guidance, the Respondent also had occasion to interview the Complainant's clients and manage weekly meetings with them.

10. At the hearing, Complainant testified that while employed at the Facility, she was attempting to obtain her LGPC license, and that Respondent replaced her initial clinical supervisor, supervising the Complainant and "three or four" other therapists while employed at the Facility.

11. The Complainant testified that her interactions with Respondent as Respondent's supervisee was

A hostile work environment from the jump—from the get-go. Even though she presented herself as a professional and respectful, she often seemed to pick personality fights or conflicts with the therapists, and the therapists all easily picked up on that in an instant...It was a stark contrast from the leadership under [the previous clinical supervisor] who we thought was brilliant....Ms. Mattox on the other hand was highly incompetent.

12. Complainant also described her weekly supervision meetings with Respondent as "routine," stating that as her supervisees:

We were supposed to get quarterly assessments done on our performance as an individual therapist. We were supposed to meet with her as often as necessary whether before an individual case or if something about our performance is questioned.

...We were supposed to relay our progress notes with our caseloads, give her our case notes, our evidence that we presented to her for how far along our clients had come, and what kind of fix we were doing, what kind of approaches that we were using to help solve our caseloads – the problems within our caseloads respectively, and then we were supposed to give those notes to her...As the clinical supervisor she was supposed to sign off on [clinical notes], and she was supposed to relay those onward. That's what she – as the clinical case manager she was in charge of all the cases we received. We couldn't pick and choose our own cases. It was up to her to decide that for us, who got the case.

13. The Complainant also stated that being “managed and overseen by someone who didn't have a practice or didn't have a valid license” detrimentally affected the Complainant's ability to credential for licensure as an LGPC.

14. On January 27, 2021, the Board Investigator conducted an under-oath telephonic interview with the Respondent.

- (a) At the interview, Respondent confirmed that her license to practice social work in Maryland was not current.
- (b) Respondent also claimed that while employed at the Facility, some of her responsibilities included “conducting meetings and reporting back and that sort of thing to the consultant and documenting activities.”
- (c) Respondent also stated that

So some of the time, it wasn't like an official thing that took place, but some of the time I did act in a role where [the Complainant] reported to me and then I would report to [the head of the Facility]...for a few weeks I would say that I was in that role of providing, you know, administrative guidance to [the Complainant] and signing off on her time and



her being assigned to me.”

(d) Respondent also confirmed that she allowed her license to practice social work in Maryland to lapse in 2018.

15. At the hearing, Respondent refused to testify under oath, stating that she was present not as a Respondent, but rather “to defend the estate” by “special appearance.” Respondent also stated multiple times that she believed that testifying under oath would be testifying “as the Board’s slave.”

16. When the Board Chair repeated her explanation of the disciplinary process and the Board’s jurisdiction over the Respondent as a former licensee, the Respondent stated that she did not believe that she was “under the jurisdiction of the Board because:

I am not a U.S. citizen, and I cannot be – if you look at the Dred Scott decision – and I am not Black. I changed my status and it might have taken time to go through but I sent it to the Department of State and everything else...That’s what a U.S. citizen is. It’s a slave. Your trust account isn’t settled until you die, and I’m a creditor.

17. Respondent waived her right to make a closing argument and left the hearing prior to the State’s closing argument.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board concludes as a matter of law that the Respondent practiced social work and clinical social work while serving as an

Final Order

*Kenya L. Mattox, LMSW, Case Number: 2020-2858*

MST Supervisor at the Facility from April to August 2020 without a valid license issued by the Board, in violation of Health Occ. § 19-401 (a) and (b).

### **ORDER**

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is this **17th** day of **March**, 2023, by a majority of the quorum of the Board considering this case hereby:

**ORDERED** that the Respondent is to hereby **CEASE AND DESIST** representing herself as an active licensee of the Maryland Board of Social Work Examiners; and it is also

**ORDERED**, that pursuant to COMAR 10.42.09.07, Respondent is to pay a fine of \$1000.00 to the Maryland Board of Social Work Examiners, within **one year** (1) of the effective date of this Order; and it is also

**ORDERED** that should Respondent submit an application for the reinstatement of her license, and should Respondent's application for reinstatement be granted, Respondent shall be placed under the following conditions:

1. That as part of her reinstatement application materials, Respondent shall undergo a Behavioral Health Examination by a Board-designated health care practitioner, to ascertain Respondent's mental fitness and ability to practice social work. Pursuant to Health Occ. § 19-317, the Board shall be responsible for any financial costs incurred by the examination.

2. That the Board reserves the right to impose any other requirements on her license, including but not limited to, probationary and supervisory conditions on the Respondent's license.

3. That Respondent shall submit written proof of her compliance with the terms of this Order as part of her reinstatement application materials, should she choose to apply for reinstatement.

**ORDERED** that the for the public disclosure, this Final Order is considered a **PUBLIC DOCUMENT** pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Gen. Prov. §§ 4-101 *et seq.* (2014) and is reportable to any entity to who the Board is obligated to report.<sup>4</sup>



03/17/2023

Date

Sondra Petty, Board Chair  
State Board of Social Work Examiners

**Notice of Right to Appeal**

Pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 19-313, you have the right to take a direct judicial appeal. Any appeal shall be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of the Final Order and shall be made as provided for judicial review of a final decision in the Maryland Administrative Procedure Act, Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §10-222; and Title 7, Chapter 200 of the Maryland Rules of Procedure. The Board should be served with the- court's process at the following address:

Daphne McClellan, Executive Director  
Maryland State Board of Social Work Examiners  
4201 Patterson Avenue  
Baltimore, Maryland 21215-2299  
Fax: 410-358-2469

---

<sup>4</sup> This includes the Board's public website and NPDB.

Final Order

*Kenya L. Mattox, LMSW, Case Number: 2020-2858*