

**IN THE MATTER OF  
MICHELE BAKER, LMT**

**Respondent**

**License Number: M06233**

**\* BEFORE THE MARYLAND  
\* STATE BOARD OF MASSAGE  
\* THERAPY EXAMINERS  
\* Case Number: 25-44M**

\* \* \* \* \*

**CONSENT ORDER**

On September 24, 2025, the Maryland State Board of Massage Therapy Examiners (the “Board”) charged **MICHELE BAKER**, Licensed Massage Therapist, License Number **M06233** (the “Respondent”), under the Maryland Massage Therapy Act, Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. §§ 6-101 *et seq.*

On December 10, 2025, a Case Resolution Conference (“CRC”) was held before a committee of the Board to determine whether it would be possible to resolve the Charges with a consent order in lieu of an evidentiary hearing. The Respondent and her legal counsel were in attendance and presented mitigating information. At the conclusion of the CRC, the Respondent agreed to the resolution of the Charges with a public consent order consisting of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order contained herein.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. At all times relevant, the Respondent was licensed to practice massage therapy in the State of Maryland. The Board initially authorized the Respondent to practice on or about October 31, 2011. The Respondent’s Licensed Massage Therapist (“LMT”) license is active and current through October 31, 2026.

2. At all times relevant, the Respondent owned and operated a business in **Severna Park, Maryland that offers massage therapy and skincare services (the “Massage Therapy Establishment”).**

3. On or about April 12, 2024, the Board received a complaint submitted by a family member of the Respondent (the “Complainant”) about two former employees of the Respondent (“Former Employee 1” and “Former Employee 2”) alleging that Former Employee 1 “knowingly employees [sic] [Former Employee 2] for couples massages at her home with the knowledge that [Former Employee 2] does not have a valid massage license.” The Complainant further alleged that Former Employee 2 uses a physical copy of an expired Maryland massage therapy license that bears her name, but the number on the license is connected to another individual (“Uninvolved Licensee 1”), according to the Board’s online license verification tool.

4. The Board verified that the license number that the Complainant alleged Former Employee 2 uses was issued to Uninvolved Licensee 1, not Former Employee 2, and has been in “non-renewed” status since 2010. Accordingly, the Board initiated an investigation of Former Employee 1 and Former Employee 2.

5. Subsequently, the Board closed the investigation of Former Employee 2 after verifying that she is not, and never has been, licensed by the Board.

6. The Board’s investigation, however, revealed that the Respondent employed Former Employee 2 to provide massage therapy services to clients at the Massage Therapy Establishment between April 2021 and March 2023, and that the Respondent failed to

timely report Former Employee 2's unauthorized practice and fraudulent use of Uninvolved Licensee 1's license to the Board.

7. During a recorded telephone interview with the Board's Investigator on August 15, 2024, the Respondent admitted that Former Employee 2 worked for her as a massage therapist at the Massage Establishment without a valid license.

8. According to the Respondent, she did not independently verify Former Employee 2's licensure status at the time of hire because she had previously attended massage school with Former Employee 2.

9. In response to the Board's subpoena for the Massage Establishment's records pertaining to Former Employee 2, the Respondent provided commission records for Former Employer 2 which show that, between April 22, 2021 and March 3, 2023, Former Employee 2 regularly and consistently worked as a massage therapist at the Massage Establishment, typically coming in about three days each week. During this period of 22 months and 10 days, Former Employee 2 provided massage therapy services to clients on over 700 occasions.

10. The Board finds that the Respondent's failure to verify Former Employee 2's licensure in the State of Maryland at or around the time hire to be negligent within the meaning of Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 6-308(a)(9) ("Is negligent in the practice of massage therapy").

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board concludes as a matter of law that the Respondent's conduct, as set forth above, in whole or in part, constitutes grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to the following statutory provisions:

**Health Occ. § 6-308. Denials, reprimands, suspensions, and revocations.**

(a) *In general; grounds.* -- Subject to the hearing provisions of § 6-309 of this subtitle, the Board may deny a license or registration to an applicant, reprimand a licensee or registration holder, place any licensee or registration holder on probation, or suspend or revoke the license of a licensee or the registration of a registration holder if the applicant, licensee, or registration holder:

(9) Is negligent in the practice of massage therapy;

**ORDER**

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is hereby:

**ORDERED** that the license to practice massage therapy in the State of Maryland held by the Respondent, **MICHELE BAKER**, License Number **M06233**, is **REPRIMANDED**; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the Respondent shall pay a monetary penalty in the amount of **\$2,500** to the Board within **90 DAYS** of the effective date of this Order; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the Respondent shall comply with the Maryland Massage Therapy Act and all laws and regulations governing the practice of massage therapy in Maryland; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the Respondent shall at all times cooperate with the Board in the monitoring, supervision, and investigation of the Respondent's compliance with the terms

and conditions of this Order. The Respondent's failure to fully cooperate with the Board shall be considered a violation of this Order; and it is further

**ORDERED** that, if the Respondent allegedly fails to comply with any term or condition imposed by this Consent Order, the Respondent shall be given notice and an opportunity for a hearing. If the Board determines there is a genuine dispute as to a material fact, the Board shall schedule an evidentiary hearing before the Board. If the Board determines there is no genuine dispute as to a material fact, the Respondent shall be given the opportunity to request a show cause hearing before the Board; and it is further

**ORDERED** that, after the appropriate hearing, if the Board determines that the Respondent has failed to comply with any term or condition imposed by this Consent Order, the Board may reprimand the Respondent's license, place the Respondent's license on probation with appropriate terms and conditions, suspend the Respondent's license with appropriate terms and conditions, or revoke the Respondent's license to practice massage therapy in the State of Maryland. The Board may, in addition to one or more of the sanctions set forth above, impose an additional civil monetary fine on the Respondent; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the effective date of the Consent Order is the date the Consent Order is signed by the Board; and it is further

**ORDERED** that for purposes of public disclosure and as permitted by Md. Code Ann., Gen. Prov. § 4-333(b)(6), this document consists of the foregoing Findings of Fact,

Consent Order

Maryland State Board of Massage Therapy Examiners Case No. 25-44M

Michele Baker, License No. M06233

Page 6 of 7

Conclusions of Law, and Order, and is reportable to any entity to whom the Board is obligated to report; and it is further

**ORDERED** that this Consent Order is a Final Order of the Board, and, as such, is a **PUBLIC DOCUMENT** pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Gen. Prov. § 4-333(b)(6) and Md. Code Ann., Health Occ. § 1-607.

01/28/2026

Date

Sharon Oliver

Sharon J. Oliver, MBA, Executive Director  
Maryland State Board of Massage Therapy Examiners

**CONSENT**

1. By this Consent, for the purpose of resolving the issues raised by the Board in this matter, I waive my right to contest the charges in an evidentiary hearing, and I voluntarily agree to be bound by the foregoing Consent Order.
2. I acknowledge the validity of this Consent Order as if entered after an evidentiary hearing in which I would have had the right to counsel, to testify, to call witnesses, to confront witnesses, and to all other substantial and procedural protections provided by law, which I waive by signing this Consent.
3. I acknowledge the legal authority and the jurisdiction of the Board to enter and enforce this public Consent Order.
4. I waive any right to contest the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and terms and conditions of this Consent Order, and I waive any right I may have had to appeal or seek judicial review of the final decision in this matter.
5. I sign this Consent voluntarily and without reservation after having had the opportunity to consult with counsel. I fully understand the language, meaning, and effect of this Consent Order, and I agree to comply with the Order's terms and conditions.


12/23/2025  
Date

Michele Baker LMT  
Michele Baker, LMT

**STATE OF MARYLAND**  
**CITY/COUNTY OF** Anne Arundel

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 23 day of December, 2025 before me, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland and City/County aforesaid, personally appeared Michele Baker, and made an oath in due form of law that the foregoing Consent was her voluntary act and deed.

**AS WITNESS, my hand and Notary Seal.**



Donna L. Rigby  
Notary Public  
My Commission Expires: 4-10-29