

**Department of Legislative Services**  
Maryland General Assembly  
2019 Session

**FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE**  
**First Reader**

House Bill 455 (Delegate Kipke)  
Health and Government Operations

---

**Physicians - Discipline - Procedures and Effects**

---

This bill requires that if only one of the two required peer review reports obtained by a State Board of Physicians' (MBP) disciplinary panel in a standard of care investigation finds that a physician did not commit a standard of care violation, the disciplinary panel must either (1) vote by a two-thirds majority to obtain a third peer review report or (2) dismiss the complaint. The bill also prohibits a hospital or related institution and a health insurance carrier from taking adverse action against a physician based solely on the fact that the physician was placed on probation by MBP if the probation has ended. **The bill takes effect June 1, 2019.**

---

**Fiscal Summary**

**State Effect:** Any change in State activities does not materially affect State finances.

**Local Effect:** None.

**Small Business Effect:** Potential minimal.

---

**Analysis**

**Current Law/Background:** A disciplinary panel of MBP, on the affirmative vote of a majority of the quorum of the panel, may reprimand any licensed physician, place any licensed physician on probation, or suspend or revoke a license if a licensed physician violates any 1 of 43 statutory disciplinary grounds, including failure to meet appropriate standards as determined by appropriate peer review for the delivery of quality medical and surgical care performed in an outpatient surgical facility, office, hospital, or any other location in this State.


Once a complaint is received, MBP staff conduct a preliminary investigation of the complaint, which includes sending a copy of the complaint to the respondent with a request for a response. The results of the preliminary investigation are then presented to the panel, which may decide to close the case with no action, close the case with an advisory letter (informal, nonpublic action), or instruct board staff to conduct a full investigation. During the full investigation, the panel may also refer the case for peer review (through its contracted peer review entity) to solicit additional expertise; cases involving standard of care require two peer reviews. The respondent is sent a copy of the peer review results and may submit a response.

The results of the full investigation are then presented to the panel, which may (1) close the case with no action; (2) issue an advisory letter; (3) offer the respondent a pre-charge consent order if there is not a factual dispute; or (4) vote to charge the respondent. If the panel votes to charge the respondent, the case is transmitted to the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), which then prepares and serves the respondent with a charging document. Once charged, the respondent is given the option to attend a case resolution conference, referred to as the Disciplinary Committee for Case Resolution (DCCR) – a voluntary, informal, and confidential proceeding before the panel. If no agreement is reached (or if the respondent declines to participate in DCCR), the case is referred to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing before an administrative law judge (ALJ).

The hearing at OAH is conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. The ALJ issues proposed findings of fact, law, and disposition; the board is not bound by these findings. If OAG and the respondent have no exceptions (disagreements) with the ALJ's decision, the case is referred to the opposite board panel (*i.e.*, the panel that did not originally handle the case) for a final order. If exceptions are filed, the opposite panel conducts an exceptions hearing and subsequently issues a final order. If the respondent disagrees with a panel's final order, the respondent may judicially appeal; however, the panel's order may not be stayed pending review.

**Exhibit 1** shows MBP's complaint investigation process, from complaint receipt to resolution.

**Exhibit 1**  
**State Board of Physicians – Complaint Investigation Process**



ALJ: administrative law judge  
 DCCR: Disciplinary Committee for Case Resolution  
 OAG: Office of the Attorney General  
 OAH: Office of Administrative Hearings

Source: State Board of Physicians; Department of Legislative Services

According to MBP's most recent annual report, there were 317 allegations of standard of care violations against physicians in fiscal 2018. Additionally, for physicians, MBP issued (1) 51 orders of reprimand with probation or orders of probation and (2) 7 orders of reprimand with cease and desist orders.

---

### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** HB 1193 of 2018, a bill with similar provisions, received a hearing in the House Health and Government Operations Committee but was withdrawn.

**Cross File:** None.

**Information Source(s):** Maryland Department of Health; Maryland Insurance Administration; Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - February 12, 2019  
mag/jc

---

Analysis by: Amber R. Gundlach

Direct Inquiries to:  
(410) 946-5510  
(301) 970-5510