GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF MEDICINE

In re:	:
KAREEMATULAI O. AROGUNDADE, M.D.	:
License No.: MD210003038	:
Respondent	:

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

This matter comes before the District of Columbia Board of Medicine (the "Board") pursuant to the Health Occupations Revision Act (HORA). D.C. Official Code § 3-1201.01, *et seq.* (2016, Repl.). The Board has broad jurisdiction to regulate the practice of medicine and to impose a variety of disciplinary sanctions upon a finding of a violation of the HORA. D.C. Official Code, § 3-1202.03; *Mannan v. District of Columbia Board of Medicine*, 558 A.2d 329, 333 (D.C.1989).

Background

Dr. Kareematulai Arogundade (Respondent) was licensed in the District of Columbia to practice medicine on January 25, 2023; her license was summarily suspended on December 30, 2025 as a reciprocal action to the action taken by the Washington Medical Commission (the Commission). Respondent was previously licensed to practice in the state of Washington, however her license was suspended on October 9, 2025.

On April 4, 2025, the Commission served an order requiring Respondent to make an appointment for a mental examination within seven days of receipt of the order and then submit to the examination. On August 29, 2025, the Commission filed a statement of charges against the Respondent alleging unprofessional conduct under RCW 18.130.180(9) because she failed to comply

with the Commission's order for a mental examination. The Commission subsequently found Respondent in default because she failed to respond to the statement of charges by September 18, 2025.

On October 9, 2025, the Commission suspended Respondent's license to practice medicine in the State of Washington, (License No. MD60629789, Case No. M2025-56). To date, the Commission has not reinstated her medical license.

The District of Columbia Department of Health (DC Health) suspended Respondent's license on December 30, 2025, in accordance with D.C. Code § 3-1205.15(a)(1)(A)(The Mayor may summarily suspend or restrict, without a hearing, the license, registration, or certification of a person who has had his or her license to practice the same profession or occupation revoked or suspended in another jurisdiction and has not had the license to practice reinstated within that jurisdiction). Although the Notice of Summary Suspension was mailed certified mail to Respondent's home address of record, it was returned unclaimed.

The Board reviewed Respondent's case, including the Commission's orders and the returned Notice of Summary Suspension, at its meeting on February 25, 2026, and voted for a Notice of Intent to take Disciplinary Action (NOI) against Respondent's license. The NOI was mailed, certified mail, to Respondent's last known address of record. It was also returned with the certified mail green card attached, on June 8, 2026. At its meeting on June 24, 2026, the Board voted to enter a final order of suspending Respondent's license.

Findings of Fact

The Board makes the following findings of fact:

1. Respondent was licensed in the District of Columbia to practice medicine on January 25, 2023.

2. Respondent was also licensed to practice medicine in the state of Washington. The Washington Medical Commission indefinitely suspended her license on October 9, 2025 for failure to obey an order for a mental examination.
3. Respondent's medical license in the District of Columbia was summarily suspended on December 30, 2025.
4. Respondent was issued an NOI that was mailed to her last-known address but was returned unclaimed, green card attached, on June 8, 2026.

Conclusions of Law

The Board is authorized to sanction Respondent under the HORA. D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.14(a) provides, in pertinent part:

> Each board, subject to the right of a hearing as provided by this subchapter, on an affirmative vote of a quorum of its appointed members may take one or more of the disciplinary actions provided in subsection (c) of this section against any applicant for a license, registration, or certification, an applicant to establish or operate a school of nursing or nursing program, or a person permitted by this subchapter to practice a health occupation regulated by the board in the District who:
>
> * * *
>
> (3) is disciplined by a licensing or disciplinary authority or peer review body or convicted or disciplined by a court of any jurisdiction for conduct that would be grounds for disciplinary action under this section; and
> (27) Violates an order of the board.

Respondent's conduct demonstrated a violation of D.C. Official Code §3-1205.14(a)(3) and (27). Accordingly, Respondent's conduct has provided the D.C. Board with a basis in law and fact to take disciplinary action against Respondent under the authority of D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.14(c).

ORDER

ACCORDINGLY, based upon the foregoing, it is by the District of Columbia Board of Medicine hereby,

ORDERED that Kareematulai Arogundade, M.D.'s License No. MD210003038, be and is hereby **SUSPENDED**, pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.14(c)(2); and it is further

ORDERED that she may not apply to reinstate her license until her license in the state of Washington has been returned to an active status; and it is further

ORDERED, that the foregoing is a FINAL ORDER of the District of Columbia Board of Medicine.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF MEDICINE

July 26, 2026
Date

By: Andrea Anderson, M.D., M.Ed., FAAFP
Chair

Copies to:

via email
Alexis Hawkins, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Enforcement Section
Public Interest Division
441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 650 North
Washington, DC 20001-2714
Alexis.Hawkins@dc.gov
Attorney for the District of Columbia

via certified mail
Kareematulai Arogundade, M.D.
[redacted]
Respondent

Review of a Final Decision

District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, § 17-4122.1 provides:

A party aggrieved by a decision of a board issued after a hearing may seek review of the decision by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals in accordance with the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, D.C. Code §§ [2-501 *et seq.*].

NOTE: *Any appeal noted to the Court of Appeals must be filed within 30 days of the final decision of the Board.*

D.C. Official Code, §2-510 provides:

(a) Any person suffering a legal wrong, or adversely affected or aggrieved, by an order or decision of the Mayor or an agency in a contested case, is entitled to a judicial review thereof in accordance with this subchapter upon filing in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals a written petition for review. If the jurisdiction of the Mayor or an agency is challenged at any time in any proceeding and the Mayor or the agency, as the case may be, takes jurisdiction, the person challenging jurisdiction shall be entitled to an immediate judicial review of that action, unless the Court shall otherwise hold. The reviewing Court may by rule prescribe the forms and contents of the petition and, subject to this subchapter, regulate generally all matters relating to proceedings on such appeals. A petition for review shall be filed in such Court within such time as such Court may by rule prescribe and a copy of such petition shall forthwith be served by mail by the clerk of the Court upon the Mayor or upon the agency, as the case may be. Within such time as may be fixed by rule of the Court, the Mayor or such agency shall certify and file in the Court the exclusive record for decision and any supplementary proceedings, and the clerk of the Court shall immediately notify the petitioner of the filing thereof. Upon the filing of a petition for review, the Court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to affirm, modify, or set aside the order or decision complained of, in whole or in part, and, if need be, to remand the case for further proceedings, as justice may require. Filing of a petition for review shall not in itself stay enforcement of the order or decision of the Mayor or the agency, as the case may be. The Mayor or the agency may grant, or the reviewing Court may order, a stay upon appropriate terms. The Court shall hear and determine all appeals upon the exclusive record for decision before the Mayor or the agency. The review of all administrative orders and decisions by the Court shall be limited to such issues of law or fact as are subject to review on appeal under applicable statutory law, other than this subchapter. In all other cases the review by the Court of administrative orders and decisions shall be in accordance with the rules of law which define the scope and limitations of review of administrative proceedings. Such rules shall include, but not be limited to, the power of the Court:

(1) Subject to subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section and so far as necessary to decision and where presented, to decide all relevant questions of law, to interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and to determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of any action;

(2) To compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and

(3) To hold unlawful and set aside any action or findings and conclusions found to be:

(A) Arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;

(B) Contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;

(C) In excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory rights;

(D) Without observance of procedure required by law, including any applicable procedure provided by this subchapter; or

(E) Unsupported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceedings before the Court.

(b) In reviewing administrative orders and decisions, the Court shall review such portions of the exclusive record as may be designated by any party. The Court may invoke the rule of prejudicial error.

(c) In reviewing an order or decision of an agency in any court or administrative proceeding, including proceedings under subsection (a) of this section, the reviewing tribunal shall defer to the agency's reasonable interpretation of a statute or rule it administers, when the statute or rule is silent or ambiguous with respect to a specific issue; provided, that the interpretation is not plainly wrong or inconsistent with either the statute's or rule's language or the legislature's or agency's intent.

(d) In reviewing a rule adopted by an agency, the reviewing tribunal shall defer to the agency's reasonable interpretation of a statute it administers, when the statute is silent or ambiguous with respect to a specific issue; provided, that the interpretation is not plainly wrong or inconsistent with either the statute's language or the legislature's intent.

(e) In determining whether an interpretation by an agency is reasonable under subsection (c) or (d) of this section, the reviewing tribunal may consider, among other factors:

(1) Whether the interpretation provided by an agency has been consistent and longstanding;

(2) Whether the specific issue is within the scope of the agency's subject matter-expertise; and

(3) The thoroughness and formality of the agency's consideration.