IN THE MATTER OF VICKY WING LAI WONG LICENSE NO. TA2366

* * * * * * * * * * * *

BEFORE THE MARYLAND BOARD OF EXAMINERS IN OPTOMETRY

CASE NO. 2016-008

* * * * * * * * * * *

CONSENT ORDER

On or about May 20, 2016, the Maryland Board of Examiners in Optometry (the “Board”) charged Vicky Wing Lai Wong (“Respondent”), license number TA2366, pursuant to the Maryland Optometry Practice Act (the “Act”) codified at Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. (H.O.) § 11-101, et seq. (2014 Repl., 2015 Supp.).

The pertinent provisions of the Act under which the Board voted charges are as follows:

§ 11-501. Practicing without license.

Except as otherwise provided in this title, a person may not practice, attempt to practice, or offer to practice optometry in this State unless licensed by the Board.

On June 23, 2016, Respondent, her attorney, and the Administrative Prosecutor on behalf of the State appeared before the Case Resolution Conference (“CRC”) Committee of the Board, during which the parties agreed to enter into this Consent Order. A quorum of the Board accepted the negotiated settlement on July 27, 2016.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Respondent was originally licensed to practice optometry in Maryland on July 2, 2013 under license number TA2366.

2. During the period relevant to this matter, Respondent practiced at a vision center in Rockville, Maryland.

4. On July 6, 2015, the Board sent Respondent a letter to her address of record informing her that her license had expired and that pursuant to Md. Cod Ann., Health Occ. § 11-308(e), Respondent could renew her license within a 30 day grace period from the date of expiration date and that the Board would assess a $100 late fee.

5. On December 8, 2015, Respondent emailed the Board to request a license renewal application.

6. Respondent submitted the completed reinstatement application on or about December 30, 2015.


8. Shortly thereafter the Board conducted an investigation to determine if Respondent had practiced optometry without a license for the period between July 1, 2015 and January 5, 2016.

9. The Board’s investigator interviewed Respondent, who admitted that she had indeed continued to practice during this period. She stated that it was her understanding that her license would expire in June 2016.

10. Respondent further stated that she discovered the lapse in licensure when her employer’s office manager conducted a credentials audit for the practice’s insurer and that she immediately sought reinstatement.

11. The Board investigator also obtained Respondent’s patient appointment calendar for the period July 1, 2015 – January 30, 2016.

12. During the period that Respondent’s license had lapsed (i.e. July 1, 2015 – January 5, 2016), Respondent had approximately 2,563 appointments with hundreds of patients wherein she provided various levels of care.
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board concludes as a matter of law that the Respondent is subject to discipline pursuant to H.O. § 11-501 and is subject to a monetary penalty pursuant to § 11-505(b)(2).

ORDER

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

ORDERED that Respondent’s license to practice optometry is hereby REPRIMANDED, and it is further

ORDERED that Respondent be issued a fine of two thousand five hundred dollars ($2,500.00), payable to the Board within thirty (30) days from the effective date of this Consent Order¹, and is it further

ORDERED that if Respondent violates any of the terms and conditions of this Consent Order (including failing to pay the fine within thirty (30) days from the date of the Consent Order), the Board, in its discretion, after notice and an opportunity for an evidentiary hearing if there is a genuine dispute as to the underlying material facts, or an opportunity for a show cause hearing before the Board otherwise, may impose any sanctions which the Board may have imposed in this case, including probation, reprimand, suspension, revocation and/or monetary penalty; and it is further

ORDERED that Respondent shall be responsible for all costs associated with her compliance with the Consent Order; and it is further


¹ The effective date of this Consent Order is the date upon which the Board’s designee signs this Consent Order.
July 27, 2016

Date

Andrew Doyle, O.D., President
Maryland Board of Examiners
in Optometry
CONSENT

I, Vicky Wing Lai Wong, acknowledge that 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.

I acknowledge the validity of this Consent Order as if entered into after the conclusion of a formal evidentiary hearing in which I would have had 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 provided by the law.

I agree to forego my opportunity to challenge these allegations. I acknowledge the legal authority and jurisdiction of the Board to initiate these proceedings and to issue and enforce this Consent Order. I affirm that I am waiving my right to appeal any adverse ruling of the Board that might have followed after any such hearing.

I sign this Consent Order voluntarily and without reservation after having consulted with counsel, and I fully understand and comprehend the language, meaning and terms of this Consent Order.

Date: 08/02/2015

Vicky Wing Lai Wong
NOTARY

STATE OF MARYLAND
CITY/COUNTY OF Montgomery

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 2nd day of August, 2016, before me, a Notary Public of the foregoing State and City/County personally appeared VICKY WING LAI WONG, License Number TA2366, and made oath in due form of law that signing the foregoing Consent Order was her voluntary act and deed.

AS WITNESSETH my hand and notary seal.

My commission expires: __________________________

KORALIA SILES
Notary Public
Montgomery County
Maryland
My Commission Expires Jan. 25, 2019