GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BOARD OF MEDICINE

IN RE:	:
REGINALD WILLS, M.D.	:
License No.: MD8436	:
Respondent	:

ORDER ACCEPTING LICENSE SURRENDER

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.)). D.C. Official Code § 3-1202.03(a)(2) authorizes the Board to regulate the practice of medicine in the District of Columbia. 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, § 3-1205.14; *Mannan v. District of Columbia Board of Medicine*, 558 A.2d 329, 333 (D.C.1989). The Council of the District of Columbia, in amending the HORA, "intended to strengthen enforcement of its licensing laws." *Davidson v. District of Columbia Board of Medicine*, 562 A.2d 109, 113 (D.C.1989). And the HORA "was designed to 'address modern advances and community needs *with the paramount consideration of protecting the public interest*.'" *Joseph v. District of Columbia Board of Medicine*, 587 A.2d 1085, 1088 (D.C.1991) (*quoting* Report of the D.C. Council on Consumer and Regulatory Affairs on Bill 6-317, at 7 (November 26, 1985)) (emphasis added by court)).

Background

Dr. Reginald Wills (Respondent) has been licensed in the District of Columbia to practice medicine since October 7, 1975. His private practice was located in a residential area in

Washington D.C. and his practice was adult outpatient services, primarily pain management. On or about February 12, 2025, the Board received notification from Walgreens that it had "discontinued dispensing controlled substances prescribed by" Respondent. Upon investigation, it was found that Respondent prescribed multiple controlled substances to at least eleven (11) individuals but failed to comply with the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP) query requirements (D.C. Code § 48-853.03c(a)) or the regulatory standards for prescribing controlled substances for pain management pursuant to 17 DCMR § 4616. As a result, his license was summarily suspended on July 16, 2025.

While the case was under the Board's review, Respondent submitted the "Affidavit of Reginald Wills to Surrender License," ("Affidavit") attached to and incorporated into this Order. The Board considered the Affidavit at its meeting on March 25, 2026, and voted to accept Respondent's surrender in accordance with D.C. Code § 3-1205.17(b).

ORDER

In accordance with D.C. Code § 3-1205.17(b), Respondent's surrender of his license is **ACCEPTED**; and it is also

ORDERED that the *Notice of Summary Action to Suspend License* issued on July 16, 2025 is terminated pursuant to 17 DCMR 4118.11.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF MEDICINE

April 3, 2026
Date

By: Andrea Anderson, MD, MEd, FAAFP
Chairperson

ATTACHMENT A

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF MEDICINE

IN THE MATTER OF	)
	)
REGINALD WILLS, MD	)
	)
	)
License No. MD8436	)
	)

AFFIDAVIT OF REGINALD WILLS TO SURRENDER LICENSE

I, Reginald Wills, MD, am over the age of eighteen, and I am competent to state the following:

1. Pursuant to D.C. Code §3-1205.17, I am submitting this Affidavit.

2. I desire to surrender my District of Columbia medical license, MD8436.

3. I take this action freely and voluntarily, and this choice is not the result of duress or coercion. I do not wish to exercise my rights to a hearing in this matter and therefore waive all rights to a hearing.

4. I have had the opportunity to receive advice of counsel in making my decision to surrender my license.

5. With the return of this affidavit, I also return all license documents issued to me by the District of Columbia Department of Health to the extent possible.

2/10/26
Date

Reginald Wills, MD
License No.:MD8436

Sworn and subscribed before me on this 10th day of February, 2026.

DONALD HAMILTON
District of Columbia Notary Public
My Commission Expires Oct. 14, 2030

Donald Hamilton
NOTARY PUBLIC SEAL

My Commission Expires:

Judicial Review of Final Actions by a Board
Pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.20:
Any person aggrieved by a final decision of a board or the Mayor may appeal the decision to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 2-510.

NOTE: Any appeal noted to the Court of Appeals must be filed within 30 days of the final decision of the Board. See D.C. Court of Appeals Rule 15(a)(2).

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) and (d) 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 the Mayor or an agency in any court or administrative proceeding, including but not limited to proceedings under subsection (a) of this section, the reviewing tribunal shall defer to the Mayor's or agency's reasonable interpretation of a statute or regulation it administers; provided, that the interpretation is not plainly wrong, or inconsistent with the statutory or regulatory language or the legislature's intent.

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

Copies to:

Via email:

G. Branch Talor, Esq.
104 West Street
PO Box 551
Annapolis, MD 21404-0551
gbt@whartonlevin.com