

IN THE MATTER OF
AMARACHI OKEKE

Pharmacist

License No. 29492

* BEFORE THE MARYLAND
* STATE BOARD OF
* PHARMACY
* Case No.: 25-403

* * * * *

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

Procedural Background

On or about May 19, 2025, the Maryland Board of Pharmacy (the “Board”) received notification from a chain pharmacy in Anne Arundel County (“Pharmacy A”) that pharmacist Amarachi Okeke, License No. 29492 (the “Respondent”) had been self-prescribing unauthorized non-controlled prescriptions. On October 15, 2025, following an investigation, the Board issued Charges against the Respondent’s license to practice pharmacy. The Board held an evidentiary hearing on the Charges on June 17, 2026, in accordance with the Maryland Administrative Procedure Act, Md. Code Ann., State Gov’t § 10-201 *et seq.*, and the Board’s regulations, COMAR 10.34.01. Following the hearing, the same quorum of the Board convened to deliberate and voted unanimously to issue the sanction as set forth in this Final Decision and Order.

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

A. Documents

The following documents were admitted into evidence.

State’s Exhibit No. 1 - P.A.’s Discharge Instructions

State’s Exhibit No. 2 - Prescriptions

State's Exhibit No. 3 - Respondent's written statement
State's Exhibit No. 4 - Surveillance video from Pharmacy A
State's Exhibit No. 5 - Pharmacy's District Asset Protection Leader Statement
State's Exhibit No. 6 - Charges with Letter of Procedure

Respondent's Exhibit No. 1 - After Visit Summary 2/2019
Respondent's Exhibit No. 2 - After Visit Summary 7/2020
Respondent's Exhibit No. 3 - MyChart Note from Care Team 2020
Respondent's Exhibit No. 4 - MyChart – Dr. A Visit 5/2025
Respondent's Exhibit No. 5 - MyChart – Dr. A Visit 2026
Respondent's Exhibit No. 6 - MyChart - Dr. A Notes 4/2026
Respondent's Exhibit No. 7 - MyChart – Dr. A Notes 8/2025
Respondent's Exhibit No. 8 - Pharmacy B's Fill History 2026

B. Witnesses

State: J. D., Physician Assistant

M. N., DAPL for Pharmacy A

Respondent: Amarachi Okeke, Pharmacist

FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the documentary and testimonial evidence admitted at the evidentiary hearing, the Board finds the following:

1. At all times relevant hereto, the Respondent was licensed to practice pharmacy in the State of Maryland. The Respondent was originally licensed to practice pharmacy in Maryland on October 16, 2023, under license number 294492. The Respondent's license is scheduled to expire on May 31, 2027.

2. At all times relevant hereto, the Respondent was employed as a pharmacist and was the Pharmacy Manager at a pharmacy ("Pharmacy A")¹ located in Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

3. On or about May 19, 2025, Pharmacy A notified the Board that the Respondent was self-prescribing and dispensing unauthorized non-controlled prescriptions in violation of Company Policy and State law. Following receipt of the notification, the Board initiated an investigation. [State's Exhibit 6]

4. The Board obtained Pharmacy A's internal investigation report including reports of a written interview with the Respondent, a witness statement, video footage related to the incident(s), and copies of forged prescription orders from the Pharmacy. [State's Exhibits 2-5]

5. The District Asset Protection Leader (Asset Leader 1) testified that she interviewed the Respondent on April 19, 2025, at Pharmacy A. She further testified that she wrote down the questions and the Respondent wrote down her answers in a "Statement". A second employee (Asset Leader 2) witnessed the interview. During the

¹ In order to maintain confidentiality, names of individuals and facilities involved in this matter will not be used in this document but were available to the Respondent on request.

interview, the Respondent admitted to writing prescriptions for herself. [State's Ex. 3; T. 21-23]

6. The Respondent originally had valid prescriptions for some of the prescriptions issued by a Physician Assistant (P.A.) at an urgent care center. The original prescriptions issued by the P.A. did not authorize refills. The discharge instructions by the P.A. states, "Please return to the clinic in 3 day(s) if not better. Call or return to this clinic sooner if your condition worsens or if you have any concerns." [State's Ex. 1; T. 15]

7. The P.A. testified that she treated the Respondent on January 29, 2025, and the last prescription she issued was dated January 31, 2025. The P.A. confirmed that the subsequent prescriptions issued under the P.A.'s name for the Respondent were not authorized by the P.A. Furthermore, the P.A. testified that she would not have prescribed certain medications falsified by the Respondent for the Respondent's conditions. [T. 13-14, 16-17]

8. The Respondent forged telephonic prescriptions under the name of the P.A. The Respondent admitted to creating false prescriptions that were dispensed to her on February 7, February 13, February 22, February 23, February 25, February 27, March 9 (2 prescriptions), March 22 (3 prescriptions), and March 23, 2025. [State's Exhibit 3]

9. The falsified prescriptions created by the Respondent included certain drugs and formulations that were never prescribed by the P.A.; and one of the drugs was intended to treat a condition never evaluated by the P.A. [State's Exhibits 1-2; T. 49, 53]

10. The Respondent stated that as a pharmacist she is an authorized prescriber of certain medications such as contraceptives. However, the Respondent did not have

prescriptive authority to independently prescribe any of the prescription drugs at issue for any patient, including herself. [State's Exhibit 3; T. 50]

11. The Respondent stated that she falsified these prescriptions because her symptoms were continuing and she did not have sufficient time off from work to return to seek treatment. [T. 38, 54]

12. The Respondent submitted the false prescriptions through her insurance provider. Pharmacy A subsequently reversed the insurance claims. [T. 31, 45, 49]

OPINION

Pharmacists play an integral role in the provision of healthcare services to Maryland patients and are generally viewed as one of the most trusted healthcare professionals. In addition, because of their direct access to drugs, many of which are addictive and can be dangerous, pharmacists are expected to act with integrity with respect to drug laws, including when obtaining prescriptions for themselves.

The Respondent falsified prescriptions for herself on numerous occasions. Although she admitted to her misconduct when confronted by her pharmacy employer, the Board found the Respondent's testimony lacked genuine accountability. The Respondent asserted in both her testimony and witness statement that she was an authorized prescriber knowing that she was not authorized to prescribe any of the drugs at issue. Furthermore, the Respondent asserted in both her testimony and witness statement that the prescriptions she falsified were essentially reissuance of prescriptions originally issued by the P.A. at the urgent care center. However, one of the falsified prescriptions was for a completely

unrelated condition that was never evaluated by the P.A., and other drugs and formulations falsified by the Respondent were never authorized by the P.A. Lastly, the Respondent submitted these prescriptions to her insurance coverage provider knowing they were falsified.

The Board appreciates that the Respondent's work schedule at Pharmacy A was demanding; however, this does not excuse the Respondent from obtaining a valid prescription for prescription drugs, as any other patient must do. Indeed, pharmacists are the healthcare professionals responsible for ensuring prescription validity and as such, the Respondent's conduct at minimum should comply with basic prescription requirements.

The Board's sanctioning guidelines provide for a minimum of a reprimand and \$250 fine and maximum of a revocation and \$10,000 fine as a potential sanction in cases where a pharmacist dispenses a prescription drug without a prescription. COMAR 10.34.11.04. Upon review of the evidence in the record, the Board believes a reprimand, fine and continuing education is the appropriate sanction in this case to address the violations found herein.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the foregoing summary of evidence, findings of fact, and opinion, the Board concludes that the Respondent is subject to discipline pursuant to the Act, Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. §§ 12-313(b)(7), (15), (16) and (25), and COMAR 10.34.10.01A(1) and B(3).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, Opinion, and Conclusions of Law, by a unanimous decision of a quorum of the Board, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the Respondent's license to practice pharmacy in Maryland, License No. 29492, shall be REPRIMANDED; and be it further,

ORDERED that, within six (6) months of the date of this Order, the Respondent shall pay a civil fine in the amount of ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$1,000) payable to the Maryland State Board of Pharmacy with a reference to Case Number 25-403, and sent to:

Santander Bank
Attn: State of MD - Board of Pharmacy
Lockbox 2051
101 Woodcrest Road, Suite 201
Cherryhill, New Jersey 08003

and be it further,

ORDERED that the Respondent shall successfully complete six (6) continuing education credits in a Board-approved healthcare ethics course within 90 days of the date of this Order; and be it further,

ORDERED that in the event Respondents fail to fully comply with any of the provisions of this Order, the Board may pursue further disciplinary action against Respondent provided that the Respondent is provided notice and an opportunity for a hearing prior to taking such action; and be it further,

ORDERED that the Respondent is responsible for bearing all costs associated with complying with the terms of this Order; and be it further,

ORDERED that this is a final order of the Maryland Board of Pharmacy and as such is a **PUBLIC DOCUMENT** pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Gen. Provisions Art. § 4-333(b).

8-18-26

Date

Deena Speights-Napata

Deena Speights-Napata, M.A.

Executive Director for

Akash Patel, Pharm. D.

President

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 12-316, the Respondent has the right to seek judicial review of this Order. Any petition for judicial review shall be filed within thirty days from the date of mailing of this Order. The cover letter accompanying this Order indicates the date the decision is mailed. Any petition for judicial review shall be made as provided for in the Administrative Procedure Act, Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-201 *et seq.*, and Title 7, Chapter 200 of the Maryland Rules of Procedure.

If the Respondent files a petition for judicial review, the Board is a party and should be served with the court's process at the following address:

Maryland State Board of Pharmacy
Deena Speights-Napata, MA, Executive Director
4201 Patterson Avenue, 5th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Notice of any petition should also be sent to the Board's counsel at the following address:

Linda M. Bethman
Assistant Attorney General
Maryland Department of Health
300 West Preston Street, Suite 302
Baltimore, Maryland 21201