	1							
1	Kamala D. Harris							
2	Attorney General of California ALFREDO TERRAZAS							
3	Senior Assistant Attorney General LINDA K, SCHNEIDER							
4	Supervising Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 101336							
5	110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101							
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266							
7	Telephone: (619) 645-2105 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant							
8		r Tur						
9	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS							
10	STATE OF CA							
11	I. d. M. H. Gil Gilder G. A. C. L.	G N. 4271						
12	In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:	Case No. 4371						
13	ERIK OMAR ELOISA	STATEMENT OF ISSUES						
14	Designated Representative Applicant.							
15	Respondent.							
16								
17	Complainant alleges:							
18	PARTIES							
19	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Statement of Issues solely in her official							
20	capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.							
21	2. On or about September 26, 2011, the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer							
22	Affairs received an application for a Designated Representative License from Erik Omar Eloisa							
23	(Respondent). Respondent has also used the names Erik Eloisa Soriano, Erik Omar Eloisa							
24	Soriano, Erik Eloisa Sorianno and Eric Soriano. On or about June 21, 2012, the Board denied the							
25	application. On or about June 27, 2012, Respondent appealed the Board's denial and requested a							
26	hearing.							
27	111							
28	111							
.								

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Statement of Issues is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
- 4 Section 4300, subdivision (c) of the Code states "The board may refuse a license to any applicant guilty of unprofessional conduct."

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 5. Section 475 of the Code states:
- (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this code, the provisions of this division shall govern the denial of licenses on the grounds of:
 - (2) Conviction of a crime.
- (4) Commission of any act which, if done by a licentiate of the business or profession in question, would be grounds for suspension or revocation of license.
- 6. Section 480 of the Code states:
- (a) A board may deny a license regulated by this code on the grounds that the applicant has one of the following:
- (1) Been convicted of a crime. A conviction within the meaning of this section means a plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action that a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code.
- (3) (A) Done any act that if done by a licentiate of the business or profession in question, would be grounds for suspension or revocation of license.

(B) The board may deny a license pursuant to this subdivision only if the crime or act is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which application is made.

. . . .

7. Section 482 of the Code states:

Each board under the provisions of this code shall develop criteria to evaluate the rehabilitation of a person when:

- (a) Considering the denial of a license by the board under Section 480; or
- (b) Considering suspension or revocation of a license under Section 490.

Each board shall take into account all competent evidence of rehabilitation furnished by the applicant or licensee.

8. Section 493 of the Code states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred, but only of that fact, and the board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question.

As used in this section, "license" includes "certificate," "permit," "authority," and "registration."

9. 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:

.

(h) The administering to oneself, of any controlled substance, or the use of any dangerous drug or of alcoholic beverages to the extent or in a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to oneself, to a person holding a license under this chapter, or to any other person or to the public, or to the extent that the use impairs the ability of the person to conduct with safety to the public the practice authorized by the license.

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

2526

27

28

(k) The conviction of more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any dangerous drug or alcoholic beverage, or any combination of those substances.

(1) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. The record of conviction of a violation of Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 801) of Title 21 of the United States Code regulating controlled substances or of a violation of the statutes of this state regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs shall be conclusive evidence of unprofessional conduct. In all other cases, the record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred. The board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, in order to fix the degree of discipline or, in the case of a conviction not involving controlled substances or dangerous drugs, to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this provision. The board may take action when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing the person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

- 10. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1769 states:
- (a) When considering the denial of a facility or personal license under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code, the board, in evaluating the rehabilitation of the applicant and his present eligibility for licensing or registration, will consider the following criteria:
- (1) The nature and severity of the act(s) or offense(s) under consideration as grounds for denial.
- (2) Evidence of any act(s) committed subsequent to the act(s) or crime(s) under consideration as grounds for denial under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or crime(s) referred to in subdivision (1) or (2).
- (4) Whether the applicant has complied with any terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the applicant.

1	5١	Evidence,	ifany	ofreha	hilitation	submitted	by the	annlicant
l	رر	Evidence,	m any,	OTTONA	umanum	submitted	by the	, аррпсащ

11. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770 states:

For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a personal or facility license pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Business and Professions Code, a crime or act shall be considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee or registrant if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a licensee or registrant to perform the functions authorized by his license or registration in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(April 27, 2008 Criminal Conviction for DUI and for Driving with Blood Alcohol Content of 0.08% or Higher [0.14%] on January 20, 2008)

- 12. Respondent's application for a designated representative license is subject to denial under sections 480, subdivision (a)(1) and 4301(l) of the Code in that Respondent was convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, duties, and functions of a pharmacy designated representative. The circumstances are as follows:
- 13. On or about April 27, 2008, in a criminal proceeding entitled *State of California v. Erik Eloisa Soriano*, aka Erik Omar Eloisa, aka Eric Soriano, in the Riverside County Superior Court, Case Number RIM511107, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to violating Vehicle Code sections 23152(a) (DUI) and 23152(b) (driving with blood alcohol content of 0.08% or higher [0.13%-0.14%]), misdemeanors, with an admitted enhancement allegation pursuant to Vehicle Code section 23578 for driving with a blood alcohol content of 0.15% or more by weight.
- 14. As a result of the conviction, the Court placed Respondent on 36 months summary probation and ordered him to obey all laws, ordinances and court orders, be committed to the custody of the Riverside County Sheriff for six days, pay a \$1,488 fine, not drive with alcohol in his blood or within six hours of consuming alcohol, not drive unless properly licensed nor within six hours of consuming alcohol, not drive unless properly licensed nor without insurance or valid registration, attend and satisfactorily complete a First Offender DUI Program for four months,

8

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 |

28

and submit to chemical tests of blood, saliva, breath, or urine or any reasonable physical test upon request of any probation or law enforcement officer.

15. The facts and circumstances that led to the conviction are that on or about January 20, 2008, at approximately 8:15 p.m., Riverside Sheriff's Office Deputies, while traveling eastbound on Cajalco Road approaching Clark Street in Riverside, California, observed a black Toyota Camry make a sharp left turn where the driver nearly lost control of the vehicle and drove into the opposing lane. Deputies initiated an enforcement stop and observed the vehicle swerve left across traffic lanes and the shoulder of the road several times, and was observed to be having difficulty maintaining a constant speed. The driver of the vehicle failed to react to the overhead emergency lights for more than one mile and eventually yielded to the right shoulder. When deputies approached the driver (Respondent), they noticed Respondent and his driver were extremely intoxicated and observed several open cans of beer in the vehicle. While speaking with Respondent, deputies noticed his speech was slurred and that his eyes were extremely red and watery. Respondent had a hard time exiting his vehicle and his gait was unsteady. Deputies smelled a strong odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from Respondent's breath and person and Respondent admitted to having drunk a few beers at his friend's house. Officers observed Respondent swayed in a random circular motion while standing on a relatively level surface. Deputies performed a field sobriety test on Respondent and he failed the tests. Respondent was placed under arrest for DUI and he chose a breath test. Respondent was transported to the Riverside County Jail where he provided breath samples which registered a blood alcohol content of 0.14% and 0.13%. 111

/// ///

SECOND CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(January 21, 2011 Criminal Conviction for DUI and for Driving With Blood Alcohol Content of 0.08% or More [0.18%] on September 4, 2010)

- 16. Respondent's application for a designated representative license is subject to denial under section 480, subdivision (a)(1) and 4301(l) of the Code in that Respondent was convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, duties, and functions of a pharmacy designated representative. The circumstances are as follows:
- 17. On or about January 21, 2011, in a criminal proceeding entitled *State of California v. Erik Eloisa Soriano*, aka Erik Omar Eloisa Soriano, Erik Eloisa Soriano, Eric Soriano, in the Orange County Superior Court, Case Number10CM10624, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty of violating Vehicle Code sections 23152(a) (DUI) and 23152(b) (driving with blood alcohol content of 0.08% or more [0.18%]), misdemeanors, with an admitted enhancement allegation pursuant to Vehicle Code section 23578 of driving with a blood alcohol level of 0.15% or more by weight.
- 18. As a result of the conviction, the Court ordered that Respondent serve 270 days in the Orange County Jail, stayed pending completion of DUI Court, and placed Respondent on five (5) years formal probation. The Court also ordered, among other things, that Respondent obey all laws, rules of the Court, Probation Department and DUI Court, not drive with a measurable amount of alcohol in his blood system, submit to chemical test on demand of any peace officer, consume no alcoholic beverages and not be present in any establishment where the primary items for sale are alcoholic beverages. The Court further ordered that Respondent not drive without a valid California driver's license, not own, use or possess weapons, submit to search and seizure, use true name and date of birth at all times, seek training, schooling, and employment and maintain residence as approved by the Probation Department, not associate with anyone disapproved of by his probation officer, pay various fees and fines, attend and complete a MADD Victim's Impact Panel, attend and complete an 18-month Multiple Offender Alcohol Program, and comply with the DUI Court Plea Agreement and the Orange County Probation

Department. On June 10, 2011, a hearing was held where the Court ordered the 270 days Jail imposed on January 21, 2011 be vacated, ordered Respondent to serve 4 days in the county jail, and the Court permanently stayed the remaining 266 days. The Court also vacated the order regarding search and seizure and the order of not owning, using, or possessing any type of dangerous drugs or deadly weapons.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Use of Alcohol in a Manner Dangerous or Injurious to Self or the Public)

19. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 4301(h) of the Code in that on or about January 20, 2008 and September 4, 2010, Respondent used alcohol in a manner dangerous or injurious to himself or to the public, as is more fully detailed at paragraphs 12-18, above, which are incorporated here by reference.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Multiple Convictions Involving the Use of Alcoholic Beverages)

20. Respondent has subjected his license to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (k) of the Code in that on or about April 27, 2008 and January 21, 2011, Respondent was convicted in two separate cases on charges involving the consumption of alcoholic beverages, as detailed in paragraphs 12 through 18, above, which are incorporated here by reference.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Commission of Acts Which if Done by a Licensee Would be Grounds for Suspension or Revocation of License)

- 21. Respondent's application is subject to denial under sections 480, subdivision (a)(3)(A) of the Code in that he committed acts, that if done by a designated representative would be grounds for suspension or revocation of the license. The circumstances are as follows:
- 22. On or about April 27, 2008 and January 21, 2011, as detailed in paragraphs 12 through 18, which are incorporated here by reference, Respondent was convicted of alcohol-related crimes which are substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a

1	licensed designated representative, which would be grounds for discipline under section 4301,			
2	subdivision (I) of the Code.			
3	PRAYER			
4	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,			
5	and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:			
6	1. Denying the application of Erik Omar Eloisa for a Pharmacy Designated			
7	Representative License;			
8	2. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.			
9	DATED: 11/19/12 () maining Herold			
10	VIRGINIA HEROLD Executive Officer			
11	Board of Pharmacy Department of Consumer Affairs			
12	State of California Complainant			
13	Complaint			
14	SD2012703898			
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20 21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				