



STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY
DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

IN THE MATTER OF THE LICENSE OF

FAROOQ REHMAN, M.D.
LICENSE NO. 25MA05178600

TO PRACTICE MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN
THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Administrative Action

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
RECONSIDER DISQUALIFICATION
OF LICENSURE**

This matter returned to the New Jersey State Board of Medical Examiners ("Board") on or about September 29, 2022, upon receipt of Farooq Rehman, M.D.'s motion for: 1) reconsideration of the September 14, 2022, Denial of Application for Reinstatement of License, and 2) immediate reinstatement of his license to practice medicine and surgery in New Jersey. For reasons set forth below, Dr. Rehman's motion is denied. The Board cannot, pursuant to the requirements of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, reinstate Dr. Rehman's license, as his prior conviction of criminal sexual contact bars him from being eligible for licensure as a physician in New Jersey.¹

¹ As covered in greater detail below, on September 14, 2022, the Board notified Dr. Rehman that pursuant to N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, he was ineligible for licensure, after a review of his criminal history demonstrated that he was convicted of a disqualifying offense. On September 29, 2022, Dr. Rehman requested that his license be reinstated immediately, arguing that the Board's decision to retroactively apply N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, i.e., apply it

Board History

By way of background, this matter was initially opened before the Board on November 2, 2015, upon the filing of a Verified Complaint seeking the temporary suspension of Dr. Rehman's license. The Verified Complaint alleged that on August 26, 2015 and September 9, 2015, during the course of examinations and evaluations to diagnose and treat "right wrist drop due to radial neuropathy," Dr. Rehman, a neurologist, inappropriately and for his own sexual gratification, touched Patient 1 multiple times on her breasts, abdomen, thighs and buttocks and exposed her vaginal area from different angles, under the guise of conducting a prolonged medical evaluation.²

Following a hearing on November 13, 2015, a committee of the Board found that Dr. Rehman's behavior with the female patient exceeded all boundaries of an appropriate neurological examination and constituted improper sexual touching of a furtive and insidious nature. Accordingly, the committee determined that Dr. Rehman's behavior posed a clear and imminent danger to the public. Based on that finding, the Board temporarily suspended Dr. Rehman's license

to a conviction that took place prior to January 10, 2022, the effective date of the statute, was fundamentally unfair.

² In prior Orders, the patient was identified by initials. We refer to her herein as "Patient 1," to conform this Order with current Board practices aimed at providing even greater privacy protections for victims of sexual misconduct.

as of November 13, 2015, pending the results of a plenary hearing and further Order of the Board. The committee's findings were memorialized in a November 23, 2015 Report and Order of the Board's Hearing Committee, and were ratified by the full Board on December 9, 2015.

Separate and apart from the Board proceedings, on May 24, 2016, via an Accusation No. 16-05-273, Dr. Rehman was charged in two counts, both for violations of N.J.S.A. 2C:14-3(b) (Criminal Sexual Contact), a crime of the fourth degree. The Accusation alleged that Dr. Rehman committed acts of sexual contact upon Patient 1 on August 25 and September 9, 2015, by using physical force or coercion for the purpose of sexually arousing or sexually gratifying himself and/or to degrade Patient 1.

On that same date, via Accusation No. 16-05-274, Dr. Rehman was charged in two counts, also for two violations of N.J.S.A. 2C:14-3(b). The second Accusation alleged that Dr. Rehman committed acts of sexual contact upon Patient 2 on June 3 and August 26, 2015, by using physical force or coercion for the purpose of sexually arousing or sexually gratifying himself and/or to degrade Patient 2.

On or about June 8, 2016, under Accusation No. 16-05-273, Dr. Rehman pled guilty to a violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:14-3(b). Concurrently, under Accusation No. 16-05-274, Dr. Rehman pled guilty to a violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:33-4(a) (Harassment). On

August 31, 2016, the Honorable Dennis V. Nieves, J.S.C., in Superior Court of New Jersey, Criminal Division, Middlesex County, sentenced Dr. Rehman to one year of probation. Dr. Rehman was also required to complete a psychological/sexual evaluation, and follow all recommendations made. He was also ordered to have no contact with Patient 1, direct or indirect.

On or about January 12, 2017, following the entry of a Consent Order, Dr. Rehman's license was revoked, with no right to reapply for licensure for a period of five years from November 13, 2015 (the date Dr. Rehman's license was temporarily suspended).³ The January 12, 2017, Consent Order ("Consent Order") also provided that before the Board would consider any application for reinstatement of licensure, Dr. Rehman would need to first undergo a Board-approved psychosexual evaluation, and comply with all recommendations made by the evaluator; successfully complete an ethics and boundaries course; and appear before the Board or a committee thereof to discuss his readiness to reenter the practice of medicine. Dr. Rehman was also ordered to pay costs and attorneys' fees in the amount of \$35,738, and a civil penalty in the amount of \$10,000.

³ The Consent Order referenced Dr. Rehman's conviction for violations of N.J.S.A. 2C:14-3(b) and N.J.S.A. 2C:33-4(a) (Harassment).

Following the conclusion of the five-year ineligibility period, Dr. Rehman submitted a request for reinstatement of his license to practice medicine. He then appeared, with counsel, Amy Luria, Esq., before a Preliminary Evaluation Committee of the Board on August 24, 2021, to discuss his petition. Following that appearance, on November 16, 2021, Executive Director Antonia Winstead wrote to Ms. Luria, and advised her that the Board was requesting that due to Dr. Rehman's nearly six-year absence from the practice of medicine, that he undergo a full post-licensure skills assessment through a Board-approved program. The Board further requested that Dr. Rehman undergo an evaluation to be conducted by the Professional Assistance Program of New Jersey ("PAP"). The Board additionally advised Dr. Rehman that once documentation was received demonstrating that he had completed both evaluations, and complied with any recommendations made, Dr. Rehman could request that the Board reconsider his application for reinstatement of his license.

On January 10, 2022, Governor Philip D. Murphy signed into law P.L. 2021, c. 345. Section 3 of the new law, which took effect immediately, was codified at N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 (Conviction of certain offenses as grounds for refusal to issue, renew, or reinstate license, certification, or registration), and specifically provides:

Any entity designated in section 2 of P.L.1978, c. 73 (C.45:1-15), or any principal department of the Executive Branch of State government or any entity within any department or any other entity hereafter created to license or otherwise regulate a health care profession or occupation shall not issue an initial license, certification or registration, or renew, reinstate or reactivate a license, certification or registration unless the entity has first determined that no criminal history record or record with the National Practitioner Data Bank exists demonstrating that an applicant for a license, certification, or registration in a health care profession or occupation has been convicted of sexual assault, criminal sexual contact or lewdness pursuant to N.J.S.2C:14-2, N.J.S.2C:14-3, and N.J.S.2C:14-4 that is of the first, second, third or fourth degree, endangering the welfare of a child pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection a. of N.J.S.2C:24-4, attempting to lure or entice a child pursuant to section 1 of P.L.1993, c. 291 (C.2C:13-6), or equivalent offenses in another jurisdiction.

N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9(a).

On April 4, 2022, Dr. Rehman advised the Board that on January 11-12, 2022, he completed a post-licensure skills assessment through the Center for Personalized Education for Professionals ("CPEP"), and submitted the completed report.⁴ On July 7, 2022, Dr. Rehman provided the Board with a June 28, 2022, letter from the PAP, which advised that Dr. Rehman had undergone an updated

⁴ CPEP found that Dr. Rehman demonstrated minimal education needs.

PAP evaluation.⁵ On that same date, Dr. Rehman requested that his reinstatement request be considered by the Board at its next scheduled meeting.

On July 19, 2022, Deputy Attorney General Roman Guzik, on behalf of the Board, advised Ms. Luria that the Division of Consumer Affairs ("DCA") was currently reviewing issues related to the passage of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, and its impact upon applications for reinstatement, to include Dr. Rehman's pending application. Ms. Luria was further advised that no determination would be made on Dr. Rehman's application until DCA completed that review and determined whether the statute would preclude Dr. Rehman from being able to further pursue a reinstatement application.

On September 14, 2022, the Board notified Dr. Rehman via a Denial of Application for Reinstatement of License that a review of his criminal history record demonstrated that on or about June 8, 2016, in Middlesex County Superior Court, he was convicted of criminal sexual contact, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:14-3(b). Dr.

⁵ The PAP opined that it was in a position to support Dr. Rehman's petition for reinstatement, if certain restrictions were placed on Dr. Rehman's license. Specifically, the PAP opined that the following restrictions be placed on Dr. Rehman's license upon reinstatement: 1) that he always have a chaperone of the same gender as the patient present in the room; 2) that Dr. Rehman post signs in all rooms, including the waiting room, in both English and Spanish, advising patients that a chaperone will be present when they meet with Dr. Rehman; and 3) that Dr. Rehman meet bi-weekly with a board-approved neurologist for at least the first year of practice.

Rehman was also notified that pursuant to N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, his conviction was of an offense that disqualified him from eligibility for reinstatement of licensure. Accordingly, the Board denied Dr. Rehman's application for reinstatement. Dr. Rehman was additionally advised, that, based on the disqualifying criminal history, and consistent with N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9(a), he was not eligible for licensure, registration or certification in any regulated health care profession or occupation, and that the Board would not entertain any future application(s) that he might make for licensure to practice medicine and surgery in New Jersey.

On September 29, 2022, Dr. Rehman requested that his license be reinstated immediately, arguing that the Board's decision to retroactively apply N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 was fundamentally unfair.

On October 4, 2022, the Board advised Dr. Rehman and the Attorney General, that the September 29, 2022, letter would be considered as a motion seeking reconsideration of the Board's September 14, 2022, determination, and requested that the Attorney General, specifically the Professional Boards Prosecution section within the Division of Law, submit a response to the motion.

A response by the Attorney General was submitted on October 14, 2022, opposing the motion for reconsideration. A reply was submitted by Dr. Rehman on October 26, 2022. The matter was then scheduled for oral argument at the Board's December 14, 2022, meeting.

Argument before the Board

Oral argument on the motion for reconsideration and reinstatement of Dr. Rehman's license was held before the Board on December 14, 2022. Deputy Attorney General Daniel Evan Leef Hewitt appeared for the Attorney General. Ms. Luria appeared on behalf of Dr. Rehman.

Ms. Luria began by arguing that Dr. Rehman does not pose a risk to the public, and noted that Dr. Rehman had complied with all of the requirements of the Consent Order, kept up with medical education, and engaged in charity work. She also noted that Dr. Rehman was candid and remorseful when he appeared before a committee of the Board regarding his reinstatement.

Ms. Luria continued, arguing that the Board requested that Dr. Rehman undergo a post-licensure skills assessment and a PAP evaluation during a time period that the law creating N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 was already under discussion by the legislature. Further, Ms. Luria argued, even though N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 passed shortly after the Board requested that Dr. Rehman complete his evaluations, Dr. Rehman was not notified until July 19, 2022, that N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 may be applied retroactively and he may be disqualified from licensure.

Ms. Luria urged the Board not to apply the statute retroactively, arguing that the legislature did not indicate an intent for the retroactive application. Ms. Luria further argued

that due process prohibited retroactive application of legislation when the consequences are unduly harsh or harmful, and that the retroactive application of the law violated the ex post facto clause. Ms. Luria concluded by urging the Board to reinstate Dr. Rehman's license.⁶

DAG Hewitt began his response by reminding the Board what initially led to the revocation of Dr. Rehman's license - namely, that on two separate occasions, under the guise of performing a neurological exam, Dr. Rehman inappropriately touched a patient's breasts and buttocks, and exposed her vaginal area.

DAG Hewitt argued that when enacting N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, the legislature intended to protect the public, and that the statute was not intended to act as a punitive measure. DAG Hewitt continued, arguing that anyone with a conviction identified in N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 was now disqualified from eligibility for licensure, with no ability to show rehabilitation and no discretion given to the Board to determine otherwise.

DAG Hewitt urged the Board to determine that N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 must be given retroactive effect. He argued that even if a statute is silent on retroactivity, there are times when

⁶ As part of her presentation, Ms. Luria advised that Dr. Rehman was present for the oral argument, and requested that he be allowed to provide testimony. We denied the request, as any testimony provided would be irrelevant to our determination whether N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 applies to Dr. Rehman's conviction.

retroactively must be inferred to carry out the legislature's intent and purpose. DAG Hewitt further argued that the retroactive application of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 did not constitute a manifest injustice, as Dr. Rehman was never "guaranteed" that his revoked license would be reinstated. DAG Hewitt concluded by arguing that the application of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 to Dr. Rehman did not constitute a violation of the Ex Post Facto clause. Accordingly, DAG Hewitt urged the Board to affirm its decision.

Discussion

In our view, the stark - indeed, the only -- question before us is whether N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 applies to Dr. Rehman's 2016 conviction of Criminal Sexual Contact in the fourth degree, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:14-3(b). If the statute applies, then we, as a board that licenses health care professionals, have no choice or discretion regarding Dr. Rehman's reinstatement request. Instead, the statute compels us to deny Dr. Rehman's request for reinstatement of his license. Significantly, the statute will apply regardless whether Dr. Rehman would otherwise be able to demonstrate rehabilitation or 'mitigation' evidence, regardless whether Dr. Rehman would otherwise be able to demonstrate that he is fit and competent to resume the practice of medicine, and regardless whether any reinstatement might be structured and limited in a manner designed to limit any risk to the public (i.e., options such as allowing practice only with a board-approved

chaperone and/or only on certain specified patient populations, limiting the scope of Dr. Rehman's practice, or even requiring that any practice be conducted by telemedicine only).⁷

We begin our analysis with the observation that this motion for reconsideration is unique, as the sole question before us is a novel legal question of statutory construction. We fully recognize that our decision may well be subject to appeal, and review by the New Jersey Appellate Division.⁸

Turning to the question of statutory construction, we begin by looking to several established rules of statutory construction. In interpreting a statute, the "overriding goal must be to determine the Legislature's intent." Jersey Cent. Power & Light Co. v. Melcar Util. Co., 212 N.J. 576, 586 (2013) (quoting Cast Art Indus., LLC v. KPMG LLP, 209 N.J. 208, 221 (2012)). "In most instances, the best indicator of that intent is the plain language

⁷ Contrast N.J.S.A. 45:1-21.5, a statute that applies to all professional licensing boards. N.J.S.A. 45:1-21.5(c) creates a statutory presumption that a conviction for murder, or a conviction for any of the sexual crimes delineated therein, presumptively disqualifies an individual from eligibility for licensure. But the presumption is rebuttable, and thus a board must consider the factors outlined at N.J.S.A. 45:1-21(a) when determining whether a licensee might still be eligible for licensure even if previously convicted of a presumptively disqualifying crime. N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, however, does not include any similar allowance.

⁸ Our denial of Dr. Rehman's application for reinstatement, and the pending motion for reconsideration, would constitute a final determination of the Board. Review of final decisions of this Board are appealable, as of right, to the Appellate Division. See R. 2:2-3(a)(2).

chosen by the Legislature." Cashin v. Bello, 223 N.J. 328, 335 (2015) (quoting State v. Gandhi, 201 N.J. 161, 176 (2010)). When there is, however, ambiguity in statutory language, then extrinsic evidence, to include legislative history, can be considered. Johnson v. Roselle EZ Quick LLC, 226 N.J. 370, 386 (2016) (citing Richardson v. Bd. of Trustees, Police & Firemen's Ret. Sys., 192 N.J. 189, 195-96 (2007)).

In deciding whether a statute should apply retroactively,⁹ it is necessary to consider whether the Legislature intended to give the statute retroactive application."¹⁰ Ibid. (quoting Twiss, 124 N.J. at 467). In addressing that question, legislative intent for retroactivity can be demonstrated when the Legislature expresses

⁹ Generally, newly enacted laws are applied prospectively. James v. N.J. Mfrs. Ins. Co., 216 N.J. 552, 556 (2014). But, prospective application "is not to be applied mechanistically to every case," Johnson, 226 N.J. at 387.

¹⁰ The James decision stated that in addition to explicit or implicit statements of legislative intent, legislative intent for retroactivity can also be demonstrated "(2) when an amendment is curative; or (3) when the expectations of the parties so warrant." James, 216 N.J. at 563 (2014). So long as "one of [the three] grounds is present," a statute must be given "retroactive effect." Cruz v. Cent. Jersey Landscaping, Inc., 195 N.J. 33, 45 (2008). For the reasons set forth above, we conclude that there are clear expressions of legislative intent in the available legislative history that dictate a retroactive interpretation of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9. Given that conclusion, we deem it wholly unnecessary to even consider either of the other factors identified in the James case that might also support a retroactive interpretation of the law.

its intent that the law apply retroactively, either expressly or implicitly." James, 216 N.J. at 563.¹¹

While there is no specific language in N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 specifying whether it is to be applied only to convictions that might occur after January 10, 2022, the statute requires that all license applications (whether for initial licensure by new applicants, or for renewal, reinstatement or reactivation of licensure by those previously licensed) must be denied when a criminal history background check, or National Practitioner Data Bank records, reveal a conviction of any of the sexual offenses identified in the statute. Logically, we cannot perceive any reason why a distinction should be drawn between crimes that occurred prior to January 10, 2022, and those that occurred thereafter. Of note, the legislation did not include any language specifying that it was to apply only to individuals convicted of crimes after January 10, 2022. For that reason, we suggest that N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, on its face, is clear and must be read to disqualify any

¹¹ The Legislature's expression of intent on whether to "apply a statute retroactively 'may be either express, that is, stated in the language of the statute or in the pertinent legislative history, or implied, that is, retroactive application may be necessary to make the statute workable or to give it the most sensible interpretation[.]'" Johnson, 226 N.J. at 388-389 (quoting Gibbons, 86 N.J. at 522). "[I]f the Legislature expresses an intent that the statute is to be applied retroactively, the statute should be so applied." Oberhand v. Dir., Div. of Taxation, 193 N.J. 558, 571 (2008) (citing Gibbons, 86 N.J. at 522).

applicant whose criminal history record - like Dr. Rehman's - demonstrates a conviction of any of the enumerated sexual offenses, regardless of the date of the conviction.

Dr. Rehman argues, however, that the statute is not clear on its face, and that absent clarity it cannot be interpreted to apply to his 2016 conviction. Review of legislative history, however, is dispositive. The legislative statements offered by both the Senate Commerce Committee (May 13, 2021) and the Assembly Regulated Professions Committee (June 14, 2021) in support of S3494, included an identical concluding paragraph, which provided that:

The purpose of this legislation is to enhance public safety, by barring certain convicted sex offenders from licensure, registration or certification in a regulated health care profession or occupation. This is not intended as a punitive measure against those who have engaged in prior criminal conduct, but rather to serve the civil and remedial purpose of ensuring that those who have been found to have engaged in criminal sexual conduct which carries with it a risk of recidivism are not eligible for licensure in a health care profession or occupation which, by its nature, places practitioners in a unique position of trust and access to potentially vulnerable populations. It is necessary and appropriate for the Legislature to withhold from those convicted of serious sex offenses the State imprimatur that conveys to the public an official endorsement of such individuals to provide health care services in New Jersey.

2020 Legis. Bill Hist. N.J. S.B. 3494 (emphasis added)

In four separate places within a single paragraph, both the Assembly and the Senate made clear that N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 was

intended to apply to individuals with previous convictions, rather than only to individuals who might be convicted subsequent to the statute's enactment. Had the legislature intended that the statute only apply prospectively, the use of phrases such as "engaged in prior criminal conduct" or "those . . . found to have engaged in criminal sexual contact" would have been meaningless.

Our conclusion that the legislature intended N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 to apply to crimes that occurred prior to its passage is further buttressed by the statement of legislative purpose - namely, that the legislation was intended to "ensur[e] that those who have been found to have engaged in criminal sexual conduct which carries with it a risk of recidivism are not eligible for licensure in a health care profession or occupation which, by its nature, places practitioners in a unique position of trust and access to potentially vulnerable populations." The legislature made clear that this law was a civil and remedial measure aimed only at protecting the public from potential harm. That purpose would clearly be thwarted and compromised by any interpretation of the law that would limit its application to individuals convicted subsequent to January 10, 2022. Indeed, N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 would essentially do nothing to protect the public health, safety or welfare if read prospectively, as it would instead leave untouched the very class of individuals that the Legislature identified as being subject to the bill in the first place.

Our determination is fully consistent with the holding in Rothman v. Rothman, 65 N.J. 219 (1974). In that matter, the Supreme Court determined that the statute governing equitable distribution of marital assets upon divorce must be applied retroactively because if the statute in question was only given prospective effect, it was "estimated, apparently without exaggeration, that the full effect of the statute would not be felt for at least a generation." Rothman, 65 N.J. at 224. A similar conundrum exists here, in that a "prospective-only" application of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 would substantially diminish the full effects of the statute, and arguably would continue to expose the public to the very risks that the Legislature intended to mitigate for many years to come.

In summary, we conclude that N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 was intended to apply retroactively, and must be read to apply to anyone convicted of any of the specified offenses, regardless of the date of the conviction. Dr. Rehman was convicted, in 2016, of an offense which now disqualifies him from eligibility for licensure as a physician in New Jersey.

Finally, we point out that our decision is fully consistent with well-established law in New Jersey recognizing the State's substantial interest in regulating and supervising the practice of the medical profession. The Supreme Court specifically held, in Matter of Polk, 90 N.J. 550, 566 (1982), that the State has a substantial interest in the regulation and supervision of those

who are licensed to practice medicine; that the State must act as the guardian of the health and well-being of its citizens; and that the State's interests and obligations in this regard are recognized to be paramount to the rights of an individual practitioner. The Legislature's decision, inherent in its enactment of P.L. 2021, c. 103, to disqualify a limited set of individuals from eligibility for licensure is entirely consistent with those long-settled principles of law.

We decline to address the remainder of Dr. Rehman's arguments, to include his argument that due process prohibits retroactive application of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9; and his argument that any denial of his reinstatement request would constitute a violation of the Ex Post Facto Clause. As an administrative agency, we are bound to enforce the laws. We presume that those laws are constitutional. Here, we presume that N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 is constitutional.¹²

¹² In the interest of completeness, had we decided to reach a determination regarding either issue, we would have found no merit to Dr. Rehman's arguments. Specifically, with regard to due process, Dr. Rehman voluntarily forfeited his property interest in his medical license, when he agreed to its revocation. See Limongelli v. New Jersey State Bd. of Dentistry, 137 N.J. 317, 328 (1993) (Finding that a dentist whose license was revoked "has no constitutionally-cognizable property interest".) Thus, when we weigh the State's paramount interest in protection of the public health, safety and welfare against Dr. Rehman's interest in a license to practice medicine, the balance must tip in favor of protection of the public. Similarly, we would not find that N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 violates the Ex Post Facto Clause. N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 does not increase or retroactively impose any additional penalties for Dr. Rehman's conviction. Instead, it only

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, we conclude that N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9 applies to Dr. Rehman's 2016 conviction of criminal sexual contact. As a consequence, Dr. Rehman is ineligible for reinstatement of his medical license. We deny his motion for immediate reinstatement of license, and affirm our prior determination denying his petition for reinstatement of his license. To do anything less would not only be fundamentally at odds with the mandate of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, and inconsistent with this Board's paramount role to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

WHEREFORE, it is on this 9th day of March 2023

ORDERED:

1. Dr. Rehman's September 29, 2022, motion for reconsideration of this Board's September 14, 2022, Denial of Application for Reinstatement of License, and for immediate reinstatement of his license to practice medicine and surgery in New Jersey, is denied. Dr. Rehman is instead disqualified, by operation of N.J.S.A. 45:1-15.9, from eligibility for licensure as a physician in the State of New Jersey,

establishes new licensure requirements for all health care practitioners, to include Dr. Rehman.

NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "O.F. Sabando, D.O.", is written over a horizontal line.

By: **Otto F. Sabando, D.O.**

Otto F. Sabando, D.O.
President