1	XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California	
2	Kent D. Harris Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
3	KEVIN W. BELL Deputy Attorney General	
4	State Bar No. 192063 1300 I Street, Suite 125	
5	P.O. Box 944255	
6	Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-6064	
7	Facsimile: (916) 327-8643 Attorneys for Complainant	
8	BEFORE THE	
9	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	STATE OF C.	ALIFURNIA
11	In the Matter of the Statement of Issues	Case No. 6074
12	Against:	
13	SUKHBIR SINGH BRAR	STATEMENT OF ISSUES
14	Pharmacy Technician License Applicant	
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	Virginia Herold ("Complainant") alleges:	
18	PARTIES	
19	1. Complainant brings this Statement of Issues solely in her official capacity as the	
20	Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy ("Board"), Department of Consumer Affairs.	
21	2. On or about May 16, 2016, the Board received an application for a Pharmacy	
22	Technician License from Sukhbir Singh Brar ("Respondent"). On or about May 12, 2016,	
23	Respondent certified under penalty of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and	
24	representations in the application. The Board denied the application on February 10, 2017.	
25	JURISDICTION	
26	3. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code ("Code") section 485, subdivision (b), on	
27	or about February 10, 2017, Respondent's application was denied and he was notified of the right	
28	to a hearing to appeal that denial.	
		1

1	4. On or about February 17, 2017, Respondent requested a hearing to appeal the denial		
2	of his application.		
3	STATUTORY PROVISONS		
4	5. Section 480 of the Code states, in pertinent part:		
5	(a) A board may deny a license regulated by this code on the grounds that the applicant has one of the following:		
6	(1) Been convicted of a crime. A conviction within the meaning of this		
7 8	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		
9			
10	the provisions of Section 1203.4, 1203.4a, or 1203.41 of the Penal Code.		
11	•••		
12	(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.		
13	(B) The board may deny a license pursuant to this subdivision only if the		
14	crime or act is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which application is made		
15	6. Code section 4301 states, in pertinent part:		
16 17	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		
18	not limited to, any of the following:		
19	•••		
20	(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		
21	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.		
22	the person to conduct with safety to the public the practice additional of the free file.		
23	(1) Till (1) Compatibility of the companion of the compan		
24	(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.		
25	(1) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications,		
26	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		
27	States Code regulating controlled substances or of a violation of the statutes of this state regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs shall be conclusive		
28	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.

## FIRST CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

## (Criminal Convictions)

- 7. Respondent's application is subject to denial under Code section 480, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent was convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a pharmacy technician, as follows:
- a. On or about February 15, 2001, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Sukhbir Singh Brar* (Solano County Super. Ct., Case No. FCR187734), Respondent was convicted by the court on his plea of nolo contendere to violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) (driving with a blood alcohol of 0.08 percent or higher), a misdemeanor. The circumstances are as follows: On or about December 2, 2000, a traffic enforcement stop was conducted on Respondent where he was found driving under the influence of alcohol.
- b. On or about May 24, 2010, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Sukhbir Singh Brar* (Fresno County Super. Ct., Case No. M10914722), Respondent was convicted by the court on his plea of nolo contendere to violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) (driving with a blood alcohol of 0.08 percent or higher), a misdemeanor, with one prior. The imposition of Respondent's sentence was suspended and three (3) years of conditional probation was granted. The circumstances are as follows: On or about February 28, 2010, Respondent was approaching the Sobriety/Driver's License checkpoint conducted by Fresno Police Department (FPD) officers at a high rate of speed. Respondent was commanded to stop his vehicle after he failed to stop at the designated area and drove past by approximately seven (7) to ten (10) feet. Upon initial contact, a FPD officer asked Respondent why he did not stop and Respondent

explained that he thought the officer was waiving him through. The FPD officer observed Respondent to have red, bloodshot eyes, slurred speech and had a strong odor of alcoholic beverage emitting from his breath. Respondent admitted to consuming alcoholic beverages prior to driving. The FPD Officer conducted field sobriety tests with Respondent, which he was unable to satisfactorily perform. Respondent consented to a Preliminary Alcohol Screening ("PAS") test that measured his blood alcohol level at 0.104 percent.

c. On or about August 21, 2014, in the criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Sukhbir Singh Brar* (Fresno County Super. Ct., Case No. M14918138), Respondent was convicted by the court on his plea of guilty to violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) ((driving with a blood alcohol of 0.08 percent or higher), a misdemeanor, with priors. The imposition of Respondent's sentenced was suspended and three (3) years of conditional probation was granted. The circumstances are as follows: On or about March 8, 2014, a California Highway Patrol ("CHP") officer conducted a traffic enforcement stop on Respondent for failing to stop at a stop sign. Upon initial contact, the CHP officer detected the odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from within Respondent's vehicle. After Respondent exited his vehicle upon the CHP officer's directive, the CHP officer observed that Respondent had an unsteady gait, his speech was slurred and his eyes were red and watery. A second CHP Officer was requested to conduct a driving under the influence ("DUI") evaluation. Upon arrival to the scene, the CHP officer conducted field sobriety tests with Respondent which he was unable to satisfactorily perform. Respondent submitted to a blood test measured his blood alcohol level at 0.14 percent.

## SECOND CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

## (Committed Acts which if Done by a Licentiate Would Be Grounds for Discipline)

- 8. Respondent's application is subject to denial under Code section 480, subdivision (a)(3)(A), in that Respondent committed acts that if done by a licensed pharmacy technician would be grounds for discipline, as follows:
- a. Respondent was convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a pharmacy technician, as more particularly set forth above in