IN THE MATTER OF

* BEFORE THE MARYLAND

RIA RAMKISSOON, DRT

* STATE BOARD OF

Respondent

. . . .

* DENTAL EXAMINERS

Certificate Number: 20329

* Case Number: 2019-067

* * * * * * * * * *

FINAL ORDER

On May 1, 2019, the Maryland State Board of Dental Examiners (the "Board") notified **RIA RAMKISSOON**, **DRT** (the "Respondent"), Certificate Number 20329, of its intent to revoke her certificate to practice as a radiation technologist in the State of Maryland pursuant to the Maryland Dentistry Act (the "Act"), Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. ("Health Occ.") §§ 4-101 *et seq.* (2014 Repl. Vol. & 2018 Supp.) and COMAR 10.44 *et seq.*

Specifically, the Board based its action on the Respondent's violation of the following provisions of the Act and COMAR 10.44 et seq.:

Health Occ. § 4-505. Dental radiation technologists.

- (a) Rules and regulations, competency—The Board of Dental Examiners shall:
 - (2) Adopt rules and regulations concerning qualifications, training, certification, monitoring of, and enforcement requirements for a dental radiation technologist[.]

COMAR 10.44.19.12 Penalties for Violations of These Regulations.

A. Subject to the hearing provisions of this chapter, the Board may deny a certificate to practice dental radiation technology, reprimand any certified dental radiation technologist, place any certified

dental radiation technologist on probation, or suspend or revoke the certificate of any certified dental radiation technologist, if the holder of the certificate:

(3) Fraudulently or deceptively obtains or attempts to obtain a certificate for the applicant or for another;

. . . .

. . . .

. . . .

. . . .

- (5) Is disciplined by a disciplinary authority of any other state or jurisdiction or is convicted or disciplined by a court in any other state or jurisdiction for an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action under this regulation;
- (6) Violates any rule or regulation adopted by the Board;
- (7) Is convicted of or pleads guilty or nolo contendere to a felony or a crime involving moral turpitude, whether or not any appeal or other proceeding is pending to have the conviction or plea set aside;
- (9) Willfully makes or files a false report or record or fails to file a report or record in the practice of dental radiation technology or willfully induces another to file a false report;
- (15) Behaves dishonorably or unprofessionally.

COMAR 10.44.23.03. Unprofessional or Dishonorable Conduct.

- A. A dentist, dental hygienist, or dental radiation technologist may not engage in unprofessional or dishonorable conduct.
- B. The following shall constitute unprofessional or dishonorable conduct in the practice of dentistry, dental hygiene, or dental radiation technology:
 - (8) Committing any other unprofessional or dishonorable act or omission in the practice of dentistry, dental hygiene, or dental radiation technology.

The underlying ground for disciplinary action under COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(5) includes COMAR 10.44.19.12(A):

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

BOARD HEARING

In its Notice, the Board informed the Respondent that she had the opportunity to request a hearing before the Board by submitting a request in writing to the Board's Executive Director within thirty days of service of the Notice. The Respondent requested a hearing before the Board. A quorum of the Board held the hearing on September 18, 2019. The Respondent was present without counsel. Assistant Attorney General Kelly Cooper, Administrative Prosecutor, was present to represent the State. Michael Miller, Board Investigator testified on behalf of the State. The State's exhibits 1-9 were entered into evidence. The Respondent testified on her own behalf.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The full Board makes the following findings of fact based upon the entirety of the record:

I. Background

1. At all times relevant, the Respondent was certified to practice dental radiation technology in the State of Maryland under Certificate Number 20329. The Respondent was initially certified in the State of Maryland on or about March 28, 2017. The Respondent's certificate is current through March 1, 2021.

II. Complaint

2. On or about October 20, 2018, the Respondent sent an email to the Board requesting advice on whether she would have "a chance" "to make it as a hygienist" because she did not "want to go through all the schooling and be denied [a] license" due to her criminal background which included a conviction for "child abuse resulting in death."

III. Board Investigation

3. Based on the information contained in the Respondent's October 20, 2018 email to the Board, the Board initiated an investigation of the Respondent, including reviewing the Respondent's initial application with the Board and making inquiries with other State agencies.

A. 2017 Initial Application

- 4. On or about March 3, 2017, the Respondent filed an Application for Dental Radiation Technologist Certification by Examination ("2017 Initial Application") with the Board. The Board received the Respondent's 2017 Initial Application on or about March 9, 2017.
- 5. In the 2017 Initial Application under "Section III Character and Fitness," the Respondent falsely answered "No" to the following questions:
 - a. Has any licensing or disciplinary board of any jurisdiction, including Maryland, or any federal entity denied your application for certification, reinstatement, or renewal, or taken any action against your certificate, including but not limited to reprimand, suspension, revocation, a fine or non-judicial punishment? If you are under Board Order or were ever under Board Order in a state other than

Maryland you must enclose a certified legible copy of the entire Order with this application.

- b. Have any investigations or charges been brought against you or are any currently pending in any jurisdiction, including Maryland, by any licensing or disciplinary board or any federal or state entity?
- f. Have you pled guilty, nolo contendere, had a conviction or receipt of probation before judgement or other diversionary disposition of any criminal act, excluding minor traffic violations?
- 6. The Respondent affixed her notarized signature to the 2017 Initial Application, and thereby affirmed the following oath:

I affirm that the contents of this document are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

B. 2009 Criminal Conviction

- 7. On or about March 30, 2009, the Respondent was found guilty of, Child Abuse 1st Degree: Death, a felony, in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Maryland (Case Number 108241041).
- 8. On or about April 21, 2010, the Respondent was sentenced to twenty (20) years of incarceration with eighteen (18) years, two (2) months, and seventeen (17) days suspended. The Respondent was also given credit for time served in the amount of one (1) year, nine (9) months, and thirteen (13) days. The Respondent was also sentenced to five (5) years of supervised probation. As part of her probation, the Respondent was ordered "to successfully complete treatment at [a Treatment Facility¹] and any aftercare."

¹ For confidentiality and privacy purposes, the names of individuals and facilities involved in this case are not disclosed in this document. The Respondent may obtain the names of all individuals and facilities referenced in this document by contacting the administrative prosecutor.

C. 2016 Denial of Application for Certification

- 9. On or about June 21, 2016, the Maryland Board of Nursing issued a Default Final Decision and Order of Denial of Application for Medication Technician Certification (the "2016 Order"), which denied the Respondent's application for a medication technician certificate, as a result of her 2009 criminal conviction for first-degree child abuse resulting in the death of a child as set forth above.
 - 10. The 2016 Order made the following Findings of Fact:
 - a. In a letter of explanation sent to the Maryland Board of Nursing, the Respondent stated that she was found guilty of first-degree child abuse resulting in the death of a child after she joined a cult and starved her son to death in an attempt to get the "demon" out of him.
 - b. According to the Application for Statement of Charges, the Respondent deprived her son of food and water "because the baby was non-compliant with the rules of the cult and would not say 'Amen' after eating." The Respondent's son was subsequently found by the police "in a green suitcase behind a man's house in Philadelphia."
 - c. As part of the Respondent's plea agreement in the 2009 criminal conviction, the Respondent "is allowed to withdraw her plea if the [Respondent's] baby is resurrected."

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board concludes as a matter of law that the Respondent's conviction of Child Abuse 1st Degree: Death, a felony and a crime of moral turpitude, in the Circuit Court of Maryland for Baltimore City on or about March 30, 2009, constitutes a violation of Health Occ. § 4-505 and COMAR 10.44.19.12, specifically: violating a rule or regulation adopted by the Board, *i.e.* COMAR 10.44.23.03(A) and (B)(8), in violation of COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(6); being convicted of a felony and a crime involving moral turpitude, in violation of COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(7); and behaving dishonorably or unprofessionally, in violation of COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(15).

The Board further concludes that the Respondent's application for a medication technician certificate was denied by the Maryland Board of Nursing on or about June 21, 2016, which constitutes a violation of Health Occ. § 4-505 and COMAR 10.44.19.12, specifically: being disciplined by a disciplinary authority for an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action under this regulation, *i.e.* COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(7), in violation of COMAR 10.44.19.03(A)(5).

Finally the Board concludes that the Respondent obtained her dental radiation technology certificate under false pretenses by deceiving the Board and fraudulently reporting that she had not been convicted of a criminal act, had an investigation or charges brought by a licensing board, or received disciplinary action by a licensing board, when in fact, she had been criminally convicted of starving her son to death, and the Maryland Board of Nursing issued charges and a final order denying her application for a

medication technician certificate, in violation of Health Occ. § 4-505, COMAR 10.44.19.12 and COMAR 10.44.23.03, specifically: fraudulently or deceptively obtaining or attempting to obtain a certificate, in violation of COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(3); violating a rule or regulation adopted by the Board, *i.e.* COMAR 10.44.23.03(A) and (B)(8), in violation of COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(6); willfully making or filing a false report or record in the practice of dental radiation technology, in violation of COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(9); behaving dishonorably or unprofessionally, in violation of COMAR 10.44.19.12(A)(15); and committing unprofessional or a dishonorable act or omission in the practice of dental radiation technology, in violation of COMAR 10.44.23.03(B)(8).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is, by the affirmative vote of a majority of the Board considering this case:

ORDERED that the Respondent Ria Ramkissoon's certificate to practice radiation technology in the State of Maryland under Certificate Number: 20329 be and hereby is REVOKED; and it is further

ORDERED that the Respondent is prohibited from practicing radiation technology in the State of Maryland; and it is further

ORDERED that the Respondent is prohibited from apply for reinstatement of her Radiation Technology certificate for three years from the date of this order; and it is further

ORDERED that this Order is a PUBLIC DOCUMENT pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Gen. Prov. §§ 4-101 et seq. (2014).

11/8/2011 Date

Francis X. McLaughlin

Executive Director

Maryland State Board of Dental Examiners

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 4-319(b) (2014 Repl. Vol. & 2018 Supp.), you have a right to take a direct judicial appeal. A Petition for Judicial Review must be filed within thirty (30) days of service of this Order and shall be made as provided for judicial review of a final decision in the Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 et seq. (2014 Repl. Vol.) and Title 7, Chapter 200 of the Maryland Rules.