1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of California LINDA K. SCHNEIDER Supervising Deputy Attorney General SHERRY L. LEDAKIS Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 131767 110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101 P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 645-2078 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant				
	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY				
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
11					
12	In the Matter of the Accusation and Petition to Case No. 3536				
13	Revoke Probation Against,  FIRST AMENDED ACCUSATION AND				
14	STEPHEN MASON OTIS 1100 Garden View Rd #308  PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION				
15	Encinitas, CA 92024				
16	Pharmacist License No. RPH 62442				
17	One.				
18					
19	Complainant alleges:				
20	PARTIES				
21	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this First Amended Accusation and Petition to				
22	Revoke Probation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of				
23	Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.				
24	2. On or about May 14, 2009, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License				
25	Number RPH 62442 to Stephen Mason Otis, Respondent. The Pharmacist License was in effect				
26	at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on February 28, 2011, unless				
27	renewed.				
28	111				
	1				

1	action shall be final, except that the propriety of the action is subject to review by the superior court pursuant to Section 1094.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure.				
2	STATUTORY PROVISIONS				
3	7. Section 4022 of the Code states:				
4	"Dangerous drug" or "dangerous device" means any drug or device unsafe for self-use in humans or animals, and includes the following:				
5	(a) Any drug that bears the legend: "Caution: federal law prohibits dispensing without thout prescription," "Rx only," or words of similar import.				
7    8    9    10	(b) Any device that bears the statement: "Caution: federal law restricts this device to sale by or on the order of a," "Rx only," or words of similar important the blank to be filled in with the designation of the practitioner licensed to use of order use of the device.				
11	(c) Any other drug or device that by federal or state law can be lawfully dispensed only on prescription or furnished pursuant to Section 4006.				
12	8. Section 4023.5 of the Code states:				
13 14	For the purposes of this chapter, "direct supervision and control" means that a pharmacist is on the premises at all times and is fully aware of all activities performed by either a pharmacy technician or intern pharmacist.				
15	9. Section 4036 of the Code states:				
16 17 18	"Pharmacist" means a natural person to whom a license has been issued by the board, under Section 4200, except as specifically provided otherwise in this chapter. The holder of an unexpired and active pharmacist license issued by the board is entitled to practice pharmacy as defined by this chapter, within or outside of a licensed pharmacy as authorized by this chapter.				
19	10. Section 4043(a) of the Code states:				
20	(a) "Wholesaler" means and includes a person who acts as a wholesale				
21	merchant, broker, jobber, customs broker, reverse distributor, agent, or a nonresident wholesaler, who sells for resale, or negotiates for distribution, or takes possession of,				
22	any drug or device included in Section 4022. Unless otherwise authorized by law, a wholesaler may not store, warehouse, or authorize the storage or warehousing of				
23	drugs with any person or at any location not licensed by the board.				
24	11. Section 4052 of the Code states:				
25	(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a pharmacist may:				
26 27	(1) Furnish a reasonable quantity of compounded drug product to a prescriber for office use by the prescriber.				

(2) Transmit a valid prescription to another pharmacist.

28

relate to a condition for which the patient has first been seen by a physician.

- (4) Except for procedures or functions provided by a health care facility, a licensed clinic in which there is physician oversight, or a provider who contracts with a licensed health care plan with regard to the care or services provided to the enrollees of that health care service plan, require the procedures to be performed in accordance with a written, patient-specific protocol approved by the treating or supervising physician. Any change, adjustment, or modification of an approved preexisting treatment or drug therapy shall be provided in writing to the treating or supervising physician within 24 hours.
- (d) Prior to performing any procedure authorized by this section, a pharmacist shall have done either of the following:
  - (1) Successfully completed clinical residency training.
  - (2) Demonstrated clinical experience in direct patient care delivery.

#### 14. Section 4114(a) of the Code states:

An intern pharmacist may perform all functions of a pharmacist at the discretion of and under the direct supervision and control of a pharmacist whose license is in good standing with the board.

### 15. Section 4116 (a) of the Code states:

No person other than a pharmacist, an intern pharmacist, an authorized officer of the law, or a person authorized to prescribe shall be permitted in that area, place, or premises described in the license issued by the board wherein controlled substances or dangerous drugs or dangerous devices are stored, possessed, prepared, manufactured, derived, compounded, dispensed, or repackaged. . . .

#### 16. Section 4160(a) of the Code states:

A person may not act as a wholesaler of any dangerous drug or dangerous device unless he or she has obtained a license from the board.

#### 17. Section 4301 of the Code states:

The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty of unprofessional conduct or whose license has been procured by fraud or misrepresentation or issued by mistake. Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

(f) The commission of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption, whether the act is committed in the course of relations as a licensee or otherwise, and whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
2-1	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

(o) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of or conspiring to violate any provision or term of this chapter or of the applicable federal and state laws and regulations governing pharmacy, including regulations established by the board or by any other state or federal regulatory agency.

#### COST RECOVERY

18. Section 125.3 of the Code states, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS REGARDING CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS RESEARCH ALLIANCE

- 19. Respondent is and at all times mentioned herein was the CEO of California
  Physicians Research Alliance (CPRA), a clinical research company for the testing of
  pharmaceuticals and/or medical devices. CPRA was registered with the Secretary of State as a
  corporate entity on November 19, 2007. CPRA is a clinical research organization that acts as a
  site management coordinator for physicians performing clinical assessments required by research
  studies such as collecting data, and inputting data obtained from the studies. CPRA is not
  licensed as a health care facility, a licensed home health facility or a licensed clinic.
- 20. Respondent became licensed as a pharmacy intern on August 13, 2008, and prior to that time, Respondent, as the CEO of CPRA performed patient assessments, took vital signs, performed EKGs and drew blood samples for analysis, all while unlicensed as either a pharmacy intern or as a pharmacist and while not under the direct supervision of a pharmacist or other health care provider. After Respondent became licensed as a pharmacy intern, but before becoming licensed as a registered pharmacist on May 14, 2009, Respondent performed patient assessments, took vital signs, performed EKGs and drew blood samples for analysis without the oversight of a licensed pharmacist.
- 21. In or about July of 2006, physician J.N., M.D., was solicited by Respondent to become involved in conducting clinical research trials studying the efficacy of various

pharmaceuticals/devices. Respondent represented himself to Dr. J.N. as a clinical pharmacist with a Pharm.D. degree, although at that time and unbeknownst to Dr. J.N., Respondent was not licensed as a pharmacist in the state of California. Dr. J.N. agreed to be an investigator in at least three trials coordinated by Respondent. Dr. J.N. was involved with investigating a diverticulitis drug in the Shire Diverticulitis Study, and Dr. J.N. was the primary investigator in the Fralex Fibromyalgia Study and the Roche Acute Coronary Syndrome Study. In these studies the drug or device was shipped to Dr. J.N.'s office and stored in a locked cabinet. Respondent conducted the patient assessments such as obtaining temperature, blood pressure, drawing blood samples and helping to dispense medications to the patients. Dr. J.N. told board investigators that he first became concerned about Respondent when Respondent was removed from the Shire study because of unprofessional conduct. He also stated that he fired Respondent from the Roche study in September of 2008, when he noted irregularities, falsification of data and numerous professional and clinical errors. Thereafter, Dr. J.N. reported Respondent to the Western Investigational Review Board, the Food and Drug Administration, the California Medical Board and the California Board of Pharmacy.

- 22. In the later part of 2006, Respondent solicited physician R.H., M.D., to be the primary investigator in research studies involving post-surgical patients and an anti-coagulant medication used following total knee replacement. The drugs used in these studies were shipped directly to Respondent and he brought them to Tri-City Medical Center to be dispensed to patients.
- 23. Between September of 2007 and February of 2008, E.S. was a research coordinator employed by Respondent. She performed clinical assessments, took vital signs, EKGs, drew blood, entered clinical data information and obtained patient consent for treatment. She worked at Respondent's Oceanside office where investigational drugs were delivered, and records were kept documenting the receipt and disposition of investigational drugs.
- 24. In or about 2007 through 2009, physician B.F., M.D., was also involved with research studies coordinated by Respondent. She worked on studies involving fibromyalgia, diabetes and rheumatoid arthritis. Respondent brought the medications used in the study to her office where

they were dispensed to the patients. Respondent introduced himself to her patients as a pharmacist. He dispensed the investigational drugs, obtained vital signs, collected data and interviewed patients.

- 25. Prior to being licensed as a pharmacy intern on August 13, 2008, Respondent was taking vital signs, dispensing investigational drugs, conducting patient interviews and collecting research data without any license in the State of California. Between August 13, 2008 and May 14, 2009, Respondent was performing the tasks of an intern pharmacist of taking vital signs, dispensing medications, storing investigational drugs on the premises of CPRA, collecting data and interviewing patients without the oversight of a licensed pharmacist.
- 26. The unused tablets used in the post-surgical total knee replacement study coordinated by CPRA, were shipped to Fisher Scientific for destruction. Fed Ex tracking documents show that these tablets were sent from CPRA's Oceanside California address to Fisher Scientific.

#### FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Commission of Acts of Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit or Corruption)

27. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 4301, subdivision (f), in that prior to being licensed as a pharmacist in California, Respondent represented himself as a pharmacist to physicians and patients during investigational studies, as set forth above in paragraphs 19 through 26.

# SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unlicensed Practice of Pharmacy)

28. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 4301(o) for violating Code Section 4036, in that prior to being licensed as a pharmacist in California, Respondent performed the duties of a pharmacist, in that, among other things, he took vital signs, performed EKGs, took blood pressures and drew blood samples for analysis, and maintained dangerous drugs at his unlicensed business office for use in clinical studies without the oversight of a licensed pharmacist, as set forth above in paragraphs 19 through 26.

1//

#### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Practicing as an Unsupervised Pharmacist Intern)

29. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code Section 4301(o) for violating Code Section 4114, in that between August 13, 2008 and May 14, 2009, while licensed as an intern pharmacist, and while working as a research coordinator for California Physicians Research Alliance, Respondent took vital signs, performed EKGs, took blood pressures, drew blood samples for analysis, and maintained dangerous drugs at his unlicensed business office for use in clinical studies without the direct supervision and control of a pharmacist, as set forth above in paragraphs 19 through 26.

#### FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Performed Medical Procedures at an Unlicensed Facility)

30. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code Section 4301(o) for violating Code Sections 4052(a)(5) and 4052.1, in that while working as a research coordinator for California Physicians Research Alliance, Respondent performed the duties of a pharmacist by taking blood pressures, temperatures, performing EKGs and drawing blood at a facility not licensed as a pharmacy or a health care facility, and Respondent maintained dangerous drugs at his business location without the required policies, procedures or protocols in use at licensed facilities, as set forth above in paragraphs 19 through 26.

#### FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Respondent Acted as a Wholesaler of Dangerous Drugs Without a License)

31. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code Section 4301(o) for violating Code Sections 4160 in that while working as a research coordinator for California Physicians Research Alliance, Respondent acted as a wholesaler of dangerous drugs or dangerous devices without a license from the Board, as set forth above in paragraphs 19 through 26.

#### SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Warehousing Dangerous Drugs at a Location Not Licensed by the Board)

32. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code Section 4301(o) for violating Code Sections 4043(a) in that while working as a research coordinator for California Physicians

Research Alliance, Respondent acted as a wholesaler of dangerous drugs or dangerous devices without a license from the Board, as set forth above in paragraphs 19 through 26.

#### SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Permitted Unlicensed Persons in Areas Where Dangerous Drugs Were Maintained)

33. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code Section 4301(o) for violating Code Sections 4116, in that while working as a research coordinator for California Physicians Research Alliance, Respondent permitted unlicensed persons to be present in the areas where dangerous drugs or dangerous devices were stored and or possessed, as set forth above in paragraphs 19 through 26.

#### PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

- 34. On or about February 14, 2006, the Board of pharmacy received an application for a Pharmacist License and Examination and registration as an interim pharmacist from Respondent. On or about January 22, 2006, Respondent certified under penalty of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and representations in the application. The Board denied the application on June 16, 2006. Respondent timely filed an appeal on the denial and request for hearing.
- 35. On or about July 19, 2007, the Board filed a Statement of Issues against Stephen Otis, Case No. 3045.
- 36. Respondent signed a stipulated settlement agreement with the Board on April 17, 2008, wherein he admitted the truth of each and every allegation contained in the Statement of Issues, and thereby agreed to be bound by the Board's imposition of discipline as set forth in the board's Disciplinary Order in Case No. SI 3045. On or about July 14, 2008, the Board adopted the stipulated settlement agreement as its final Decision in Statement of Issues Case No. 3045 against Respondent, and assigned an effective date of August 1, 2008 to the Board's Disciplinary Order in Case No SI 3045. A copy of the Board's Decision and Order in Statement of Issues Case No. 3045, is attached hereto as Exhibit B and is incorporated herein by reference.
- 37. On or about August 13, 2008, in accordance with the Board's Disciplinary Order in Case No SI 3045, Respondent's Application for Registration as an Intern Pharmacist was granted, the registration was immediately revoked, the revocation was stayed and Respondent's

registration was placed on probation, under terms and conditions including taking and passing the California pharmacist licensure examination. Thereafter, Respondent successfully took and passed the California pharmacist licensure examination.

38. On May 14, 2009, in accordance with the Board's Disciplinary Order in Case No. 3045, the Board issued Original Pharmacist License Number RPH 62442 to Respondent, the license was immediately revoked, the revocation was stayed and the license was placed on probation for five years, under terms and condition. See, Exhibit B, attached.

# FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS REGARDING FAILING TO COMPLY WITH TERMS OF PROBATION

- 39. On June 16, 2009, Respondent appeared in person at a probation office conference, during which the terms and conditions of Respondent's probation, including the requirement that he participate in and successfully complete the Pharmacist Recovery Program (PRP), were explained and discussed. At the close of the conference, Respondent signed a declaration stating his thorough understanding of the requirements of his probation terms and conditions, dated June 16, 2009.
- 40. On or about June 22, 2009, Respondent enrolled in the Pharmacist Recovery Program (PRP). As part of the intake assessment for the PRP, Respondent was instructed to promptly contact the PRP drug testing vendor, FirstLab, to set up his account. Respondent did not register with FirstLab until approximately three weeks later, on or about July 14, 2009. Respondent did not begin to contact FirstLab daily, as required by the terms of his participation, until July 27, 2009. Respondent failed to perform his scheduled random fluid test on each of the following dates: July 21, 2009, July 30, 2009, August 10, 2009, August 17, 2009, September 9, 2009, September 21, 2009, October 6, 2009, and October 9, 2009. In fact, Respondent did not participate in any random fluid testing during his participation in the PRP.
- 41. On September 9, 2009, the Board requested Respondent to appear at another probation office conference to discuss, among other things, his failure to comply with the terms of his probation and the Pharmacist Recovery Program. During the conference, the terms and conditions of Respondent's probation were again discussed, and especially the requirement that

Respondent participate in, and successfully complete, the PRP. Respondent was specifically informed that his failure to comply with the PRP contract terms was a violation of his probation. Respondent again signed a declaration stating that he thoroughly understood his probation terms.

- 42. On or about October 8, 2009, a PRP representative contacted Respondent regarding his participation in scheduled random fluid testing. Respondent admitted that he did not participate in any of his scheduled random fluid testing on the following dates: July 21, 2009, July 30, 2009, August 10, 2009, August 17, 2009, September 9, 2009, September 21, 2009, and October 6, 2009. Respondent subsequently failed to participate in his next scheduled random fluid testing on October 9, 2009.
- 43. On or about October 14, 2009, the PRP sent Respondent a letter notifying him that he was terminated from PRP and deemed a public risk in his role as a pharmacist. PRP also sent a letter to the Board as notification of Respondent's termination from PRP.

#### FIRST CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Failure to Comply with Pharmacist Recovery Program)

44. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 13 stated:

# Rehabilitation Program - Pharmacist Recovery Program (PRP)

Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall contact the pharmacist recovery Program for evaluation and shall successfully participate and complete the treatment contract and any subsequent addendums as recommended and provided by PRP and as approved by the board. The costs for PRP shall be borne by respondent.

If respondent is currently enrolled in the PRP, said participation is not mandatory and is no longer considered a self-referral under business and professions Code section 4363, as of the effective date of this decision Respondent shall successfully participate in and complete his or her current contract and any subsequent addendums with the PRP. Probation shall be automatically extended until respondent successfully completes his or her treatment contract. Any person terminated from the program shall be automatically suspended upon notice by the board. Respondent may not resume the practice of pharmacy until notified by the board in writing. The board shall retain jurisdiction to institute action to terminate probation for any violation of this term.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

45. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition 13, referenced above, in that he failed to comply with and was terminated from the PRP, as described above in paragraphs 39 through 43.

#### SECOND CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Random Fluid Testing)

46. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 14 stated:

#### Random Drug Screening

Respondent, at his or her own expense, shall participate in random testing, including but not limited to biological fluid testing (urine, blood), breathalyzer, hair follicle testing, or a drug screening program approved by the board. The length of time shall be for the entire probation period and the frequency of testing will be determined by the board. At all times respondent shall fully cooperate with the board, and shall, when directed, submit to such tests and samples for the detection of alcohol, narcotics, hypnotics, dangerous drugs or other controlled substances. Failure to submit to testing as directed shall constitute a violation of probation. Any confirmed positive drug test shall result in the immediate suspension of practice by respondent. Respondent may not resume the practice of pharmacy until notified by the board in writing.

47. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition 14, referenced above, in that he failed to participate in scheduled random fluid testing on July 21, 2009, July 30, 2009, August 10, 2009, August 17, 2009, September 9, 2009, September 21, 2009, October 6, 2009, and October 9, 2009, as described above in paragraphs 39 through 43.

#### DISCIPLINE CONSIDERATIONS

48. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, Complainant alleges the following prior unprofessional conduct by Respondent:

# Discipline Imposed by Another State Against Pharmacist License on September 3, 1997

49. On or about September 3, 1997, in an administrative proceeding entitled *Agency for Health Care Administration v. Stephen M. Otis*, before the State of Florida Board of Pharmacy, case number 97-06132, Respondent entered into a stipulation and a final order taking administrative action against Respondent's pharmacy license.

///

27

	a.	As a result of the final order, Respondent's license to practice pharmacy was
suspended	and he	was required to enter into a written contract with the Physician's Recovery
Network (I	PRN) to	o obtain drug treatment.

b. The facts that led to the discipline were that on or about February 7 to February 15, 1997, while Respondent was employed by Medical Center Pharmacy in Pensacola, Florida, Respondent illegally procured two Demerol prescriptions using fraudulent authorizations while the pharmacy supervisor was on vacation. Respondent further filled a prescription for a child with the incorrect antibiotic, was late to work and late returning from lunch, appeared ill, and failed to report for work on one occasion. Respondent's employment was terminated. As a result of the board's investigation into the matter, Respondent was deemed unfit to practice pharmacy by reason of an abnormal physical or mental condition.

#### Federal Criminal Conviction on January 9, 1998, for Medicare Fraud

- 50. On or about January 8, 1998, in a criminal proceeding entitled *United States v.*Stephen Mason Otis, United States District Court, Northern District of Florida (Pensacola) in Case Number 97-cr-00105-RV-1, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to violating 18 U.S.C. § 287 (making false, fictitious, or fraudulent claims against the United States), a felony.
- a. As a result of the conviction, on or about January 9, 1998, Respondent was sentenced to one month in federal prison, three years supervised release with conditions as to home detention, electronic monitoring, substance abuse treatment, mental health counseling, and approximately \$2,000 in fines. On or about November 28, 2000, the federal court found that Respondent violated the terms of his supervised release (see paragraph 51), and re-sentenced Respondent to seven months in federal prison with no supervised release to follow.
- b. The facts that led to the conviction were that Respondent knowingly made and presented Medicare claims to the United States Department of Health and Human Services (requests for payment for lymphedema pumps), knowing that the claims were false, fictitious and fraudulent in that the Medical Necessity Forms, the Physician's Prescription Forms, and Patient Agreement Information Forms for each claim had either been forged by Respondent or obtained by deceit.

# Criminal Convictions on November 29, 2000, for Possession of Controlled Substances, and for Larceny/Petty Theft on June 19, 2000

- 51. On or about November 20, 2000, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Stephen Mason Otis*, Okaloosa County Circuit Court (Florida), case number 2000CF001053, Respondent was convicted of possessing a Schedule I controlled substance, possessing a controlled substance without a prescription, and larceny/petty theft.
- a. As a result of the state conviction, the terms of Respondent's federal supervised release program were violated (as set forth in paragraph 50). Respondent's sentencing was deferred and he was referred to drug court concurrent with his November 29, 2000, order (paragraph 50) and re-sentenced to seven months in federal prison.
- b. The facts that led to the conviction were that on or about June 19, 2000, while employed by the Fort Walton Beach (Florida) Medical Center pharmacy, Respondent was contacted by the Okaloosa County Sheriff's Office as a result of a complaint filed by the head pharmacist who suspected that Respondent was stealing drugs from the pharmacy's drug vault. Sheriff's deputies discovered in Respondent's lab coat tablets containing Hydrocodone bitartate and acetaminophen, a Schedule III controlled substance subject to the Federal Controlled Substances Act. A consent search of Respondent's automobile was performed and deputies found additional Hydrocodone tablets, as well as one vial of morphine and a syringe. An inventory of the vault revealed missing vials of Hydromorphone, morphine, Demerol, and Fentanyl, all controlled substances. An inventory entry for morphine on the Pharmacy Narcotic Record form showed evidence of tampering (use of white-out). Respondent admitted to the head pharmacist that he was on a substance abuse program, that he still had a drug problem, and that he had been taking drugs from the vault for his own use. Respondent's arms showed evidence of recent intravenous drug use.

///

1//

#### August 8, 2001, Criminal Conviction for Stalking

- 52. On or about August 8, 2001, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Stephen Mason Otis*, Santa Rosa County Circuit Court, case number 01000029CFMA, Respondent was convicted of misdemeanor stalking and felony aggravated stalking.
- a. As a result of the conviction, Respondent was sentenced to one year probation, and payment of fines and court costs.
- b. The facts that lead to the conviction were that Respondent continuously made telephone calls to a former girlfriend at her residence and her place of employment over a period of several weeks in December 2000, in violation of a domestic violence injunction. The victim reported the incidents to the Santa Rosa County Sheriff's Office and described the telephone calls as harassment that placed her in reasonable fear of harm. Respondent was taken into custody by sheriff's deputies on January 17, 2001.

#### Discipline Imposed by Another State Against Pharmacy License As A Result of Federal Conviction

- 53. On or about November 13, 2001, in an administrative proceeding entitled *Department of Health v. Stephen Otis, R.Ph.*, before the State of Florida Board of Pharmacy, case number 98-01994, Respondent entered into a stipulation and a final order taking administrative action against Respondent's pharmacy license.
- a. As a result of the final order, Respondent's pharmacy license was "suspended indefinitely and until such time he appears before the Board to request reinstatement and demonstrates the then present ability to practice with reasonable skill and safety, which shall include an evaluation through the Physician's Recovery Network . . ."
- b. The facts that lead to the discipline were that on or about January 9, 1998, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to violating 18 U.S.C. § 287 (making false, fictitious, or fraudulent claims against the U.S.), a felony, as set forth above in paragraph 50.

///

///

8

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

Discipline Imposed by Another State Against Pharmacy License For Violating Terms of Order

- On or about November 13, 2001, in an administrative proceeding entitled Department 54. of Health v. Stephen Otis, R.Ph., before the State of Florida Board of Pharmacy, case number 99-62600, Respondent entered into a stipulation and final order taking administrative action against Respondent's pharmacy license.
- As a result of the final order, Respondent's pharmacy license was "suspended indefinitely and until such time he appears before the Board to request reinstatement and demonstrates the then present ability to practice with reasonable skill and safety, which shall include an evaluation through the Physician's Recovery Network . . ."
- The facts that lead to the discipline were that on or about November 24, 1999, and February 3, 2000, the Department of Health performed inspections and discovered Respondent practicing pharmacy at a Pensacola, Florida, CVS Pharmacy, without first appearing before the Board of Pharmacy as required by the Final Order set forth in above in paragraph 54(a).

# Discipline Imposed by Another State Against Pharmacy License for Refusing to Submit to Toxicology Screens

- On or about November 13, 2001, in an administrative proceeding entitled *Department* of Health v. Stephen Otis, R.Ph., State of Florida Board of Pharmacy case number 00-07689, Respondent entered into a stipulation and final order taking administrative action against Respondent's pharmacy license.
- As a result of the final order, Respondent was determined to be unfit or incompetent to practice pharmacy by reason of habitual intoxication, and the misuse or abuse of scheduled drugs. Respondent's pharmacy license was "suspended indefinitely and until such time as he appears before the Board to request reinstatement and demonstrates the then present ability to practice with reasonable skill and safety, which shall include an evaluation through the Physician's Recovery Network . . . "

b. The facts that lead to the discipline were that on two occasions in February 2000, Respondent refused to submit urine samples for toxicology screens as required by his PRN contract. (See paragraph 23, above.) Two urine toxicology screens submitted in March 2000 tested positive for hydrocodone and hydromorphone. In April 2000, Respondent admitted to his counselor that he continuously used alcohol in violation of his PRN contract. Respondent was subsequently terminated from the PRN program.

# Discipline Imposed by Another State Against Pharmacy License -Emergency Suspension Order

- 56. On or about July 3, 2000, as a result of the Florida state conviction set forth in paragraph 51, Respondent was the subject of an administrative proceeding entitled *Department of Health v. Stephen Otis, R.PH., State of Florida Board of Pharmacy*, case number 2000-09721.
- a. As a result of the administrative proceeding, Respondent entered into a stipulation and order suspending Respondent's pharmacy license indefinitely with imposed terms and conditions.
- b. The facts that lead to the license suspension were that on or about June 19, 2000, Respondent was arrested by Okaloosa County Sheriff's Deputies for possession of controlled substances determined to be stolen from his place of employment. (See paragraph 51, above.)

#### Discipline Imposed by Another State Suspending Alabama Pharmacy License on February 3, 2003

- 57. On or about February 3, 2003, Respondent was the subject of an administrative proceeding entitled In the Matter of: Stephen Mason Otis, License Number 11915, Alabama State Board of Pharmacy.
- a. As a result of the administrative proceeding, Respondent's license to practice pharmacy in the State of Alabama was suspended indefinitely based upon Respondent's federal conviction (see paragraph 51, above), and the Florida Board of Pharmacy's multiple disciplinary proceedings (see paragraphs 49, 53-56).

1	4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.
2	2
3	10/00/1
4	DATED: 10/29/10 Viginia Keld
5	VIRGINIA HEROLD Executive Officer
6	Board of Pharmacy Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
7	State of California  Complainant
8	
9	
10	SD2009805033
11	
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
2.7	
28	
}	21