

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Middlesex, ss.

Division of Administrative Law Appeals

---

Board of Registration in Medicine, :

Petitioner, :

v. :

Meena D. Chaudhary, M.D., :

Respondent. :

---

Docket No.: RM-24-0668

**RECOMMENDED DECISION**

On November 7, 2024, the petitioner, Board of Registration in Medicine (Board), issued a Statement of Allegations ordering the respondent, Meena Chaudhary, M.D., to show cause why the Board should not discipline her for failing to respond to the Board's correspondence and to its order to respond. The Board referred the matter to the Division of Administrative Law Appeals (DALA) for recommended findings of fact and necessary conclusions of law. Dr. Chaudhary did not file an answer to the Board's Statement of Allegations, as required by 801 Code Mass. Regs. § 1.01(6)(d)(1), and she did not attend the pre-hearing conference held on January 10, 2025.

On January 14, 2025, I issued an order to Dr. Chaudhary directing her to show cause, in writing, why I should not: (1) find her in default, pursuant to 801 Code Mass. Regs. §

1.01(7)(g)(2); and (2) issue a decision that adopts the Board's assertions in its Statement of Allegations as undisputed and recommends that the Board proceed to determine appropriate discipline. I indicated in the order that DALA has not received an answer to the Statement of Allegations and that she did not attend the scheduled pre-hearing conference. Dr. Chaudhary has not filed a response to the order to show cause.

Accordingly, I find Dr. Chaudhary in default, pursuant to 801 Code Mass. Regs. § 1.01(7)(g)(2), and the allegations contained in the Statement of Allegations are therefore deemed admitted. See, e.g., *Matter of Steiner*, Adjudicatory Case No. 2019-048 (June 25, 2020); *Matter of Owens*, Adjudicatory Case No. 2017-031 (Apr. 25, 2018); *Matter of Russell*, Adjudicatory Case No. 2017-006 (July 13, 2017). The Board's Statement of Allegations is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and the factual allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 18 are incorporated herein by reference.

#### DISCUSSION

The Board may discipline a physician for violating any rule or regulation of the Board governing the practice of medicine, including the failure to "furnish the Board, its investigators or representatives, documents, information or testimony to which the Board is legally entitled." G. L. c. 112, § 5, eighth par. (h); 243 Code Mass. Regs. § 1.03(5)(a)(16). More specifically,

a physician's "failure to respond to a written communication from the Board under 243 CMR 2.07(12)(a) and to a Ten-day Order from the Board or its committees under 243 CMR 2.07(12)(b)" is grounds for imposing discipline under 243 Code Mass. Regs. § 1.03(5). 243 Code Mass. Regs. § 2.07(12)(b).

I conclude that the Board may discipline Dr. Chaudhary based on her failure to respond to Investigator Simard's letter within thirty days and her failure to respond to the Board's Ten-Day Order, as required by 243 Code Mass. Regs. § 2.07(12)(a)&(b). Dr. Chaudhary's failure to respond to both the letter and the Board's order establishes grounds for discipline under 243 Code Mass. Regs. § 2.07(12)(b).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, I recommend that the Board find Dr. Chaudhary in default, consider the allegations contained in the Statement of Allegations to be undisputed as a result, and impose upon Dr. Chaudhary the discipline it deems appropriate considering the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth above.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW APPEALS

*/s/ John G. Wheatley*

---

John G. Wheatley  
Administrative Magistrate

**FEB 21 2025**

