BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation Against:

Case No. 3900

OAH No. 2011040604

CHRSITINA IVY MORELAND 2190 Ellington Drive Corona, CA 92880

Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 86174

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Revocation of License Order is hereby adopted by the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs, as its Decision in this matter.

This decision shall become effective on May 4, 2012.

It is so ORDERED on April 4, 2012.

BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By

STANLEY C. WEISSER Board President

1			
1	KAMALA D. HARRIS	•	
. 2	Attorney General of California JAMES M. LEDAKIS		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General MARICHELLE S. TAHIMIC		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 147392	· ·	
5	110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101		
6	P.O. Box 85266	· ·	
	San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 645-3154		
7	Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFORE	THE	
9	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation	7 N. 2000	
12		Case No. 3900	
13	CHRISTINA IVY MORELAND	DAH No. 2011040604	
14	11 ' 0	STIPULATED REVOCATION OF LICENSE AND ORDER	
15	Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH		
16	86174		
17	Respondent.		
18			
19	In the interest of a prompt and speedy settlen	nent of this matter, consistent with the public	
20	interest and the responsibility of the Board of Pharmacy of the Department of Consumer Affairs,		
21	the parties hereby agree to the following Stipulated Revocation and Disciplinary Order which will		
22	be submitted to the Board for approval and adoption as the final disposition of the Accusation.		
23	PARTIES		
24	Virginia Herold (Complainant) is the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy.		
25	She brought this action solely in her official capacity and is represented in this matter by Kamala		
26	D. Harris, Attorney General of the State of California, by Marichelle S. Tahimic, Deputy		
27	Attorney General.		
28			

every right set forth above.

26

27

28

///

111

CULPABILITY

- 8. Respondent admits the truth of each and every charge and allegation in Accusation No. 3900, agrees that cause exists for discipline and hereby stipulates to revocation of her Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 86174.
- 9. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation she enables the Board to issue an order accepting the stipulated revocation of her Pharmacy Technician Registration without further process.

CONTINGENCY

- 10. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Board of Pharmacy. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Board of Pharmacy may communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation, without notice to or participation by Respondent. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that she may not withdraw her agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Board considers and acts upon it. If the Board fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Revocation and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Board shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.
- 11. The parties understand and agree that facsimile copies of this Stipulated Revocation of License and Order, including facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 12. This Stipulated Revocation of License and Order is intended by the parties to be an integrated writing representing the complete, final, and exclusive embodiment of their agreement. It supersedes any and all prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, discussions, negotiations, and commitments (written or oral). This Stipulated Revocation of License and Order may not be altered, amended, modified, supplemented, or otherwise changed except by a writing executed by an authorized representative of each of the parties.
- 13. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Order:

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 86174, issued to Respondent Christina Ivy Moreland, is revoked.

- 1. Respondent shall relinquish her technician license to the board within ten (10) days of the effective date of this decision. Respondent may not reapply or petition the board for reinstatement of her revoked technician license for three (3) years from the effective date of this decision.
- 2. A condition of reinstatement shall be that the respondent is certified as defined in Business and Professions Code section 4302(a)(4) and provides satisfactory proof of certification to the board.
- 3. The stipulated revocation of Respondent's Pharmacy Technician Registration shall constitute the imposition of discipline against Respondent. This stipulation constitutes a record of the discipline and shall become a part of Respondent's license history with the Board of Pharmacy.
- 4. Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as a Pharmacy Technician in California as of the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.
- 5. If Respondent ever files an application for licensure or a petition for reinstatement in the State of California, the Board shall treat it as a petition for reinstatement. Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations and procedures for reinstatement of a revoked license in effect at the time the petition is filed, and all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 3900 shall be deemed to be true, correct and admitted by Respondent when the Board determines whether to grant or deny the petition.
- 7. Respondent shall pay the agency its costs of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$7,769.50 prior to issuance of a new or reinstated license. Said amount shall be paid in full prior to the reapplication or reinstatement of her revoked technician license, unless otherwise ordered by the board.
- 8. If Respondent should ever apply or reapply for a new license or certification, or petition for reinstatement of a license, by any other health care licensing agency in the State of

California, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation, No. 3900 shall be deemed 1 to be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any 2 other proceeding seeking to deny or restrict licensure. 3 4 ACCEPTANCE 5 I have carefully read the Stipulated Revocation of License and Order. I understand the 6 stipulation and the effect it will have on my Pharmacy Technician Registration. I enter into this 7 Stipulated Revocation of License and Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree 8 to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Board of Pharmacy. 10 2-7-12 DATED: 11 12 Respondent 13 14 15 ENDORSEMENT The foregoing Stipulated Revocation of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted 16 17 for consideration by the Board of Pharmacy of the Department of Consumer Affairs. 18 Respectfully submitted, Dated: 19 KAMALA D. HARRIS 20 Attorney General of California James M. Ledakis 21 Supervising Deputy Attorney General 22 23 MARICHELLE S. TAHIMIC Deputy Attorney General 24 Attorneys for Complainant 25 26 SD2010703192/70542604.doc 27 28 5

1	California, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation, No. 3900 shall be deemed		
2	to be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any		
3	other proceeding seeking to deny or restrict licensure.		
4			
5	ACCEPTA	ACCEPTANCE	
6	I have carefully read the Stipulated Revocation of License and Order. I understand the		
7	stipulation and the effect it will have on my Pharmacy Technician Registration. I enter into this		
8	Stipulated Revocation of License and Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree		
9	to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Board of Pharmacy.		
10			
11	DATED:		
12	il .	ISTINA IVY MORELAND ondent	
13			
14			
15	<u>ENDORSEMENT</u>		
16	The foregoing Stipulated Revocation of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted		
17	for consideration by the Board of Pharmacy of the l	Department of Consumer Affairs.	
18			
19	Dated: Fcb, 7, 2012	Respectfully submitted,	
.20		KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California	
21		JAMES M. LEDAKIS Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
22		11 1 1 0	
23		Marie helle Jahin'e MARICHELLE S. TAHIMIC	
24		Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant	
25		12. Complainam	
26	SD2010703192/70542604.doc	SD2010703192/70542604.doc	
27		:	
28			

Exhibit A

. 1	KAMALA D. HARRIS		
2	Attorney General of California JAMES M. LEDAKIS		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General MARICHELLE S. TAHIMIC		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 147392		
5	110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101		
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266		
7.	Telephone: (619) 645-3154 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061		
8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY		
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation	 	
12	Against:	Case No. 3900	
13	CHRISTINA IVY MORELAND 2190 Ellington Drive	FIRST AMENDED	
14	Corona, CA 92880	ACCUSATION	
15	Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 86174		
16	Respondent.		
17			
18	Complete at all a sec		
19	Complainant alleges:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
20		<u>TIES</u>	
21		gs this First Amended Accusation solely in her	
22	official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer		
23	Affairs.		
24	2. On or about September 24, 2008, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician		
25	Registration Number TCH 86174 to Christina Ivy Moreland (Respondent). The Pharmacy		
26	Technician Registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought		
27	herein and will expire on July 31, 2012, unless renewed.		
28	.///		
-0			

- (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."

- 7. Section 490 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.
 - 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 4059, subdivision (a) of the Code states:
- (a) A person may not furnish any dangerous drug, except upon the prescription of a physician, dentist, podiatrist, optometrist, veterinarian, or naturopathic doctor pursuant to Section 3640.7. A person may not furnish any dangerous device, except upon the prescription of a physician, dentist, podiatrist, optometrist, veterinarian, or naturopathic doctor pursuant to Section 3640.7.
- 10. Section 4060 of the Code states:

No person shall possess any controlled substance, except that furnished to a person upon the prescription of a physician, dentist, podiatrist, optometrist, veterinarian, or naturopathic doctor pursuant to Section 3640.7, or furnished pursuant to a drug order issued by a certified nurse-midwife pursuant to Section 2746.51, a nurse practitioner pursuant to Section 2836.1, or a physician assistant pursuant to Section 3502.1, or naturopathic doctor pursuant to Section 3640.5, or a pharmacist pursuant to either subparagraph (D) of paragraph (4) of, or clause (iv) of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (5) of, subdivision (a) of Section 4052. This section shall not apply to the possession of any controlled substance by a manufacturer, wholesaler, pharmacy, pharmacist, physician, podiatrist, dentist, optometrist, veterinarian, naturopathic doctor, certified nurse-midwife, nurse practitioner, or physician assistant, when in stock in containers correctly labeled with the name and address of the supplier or producer.

Nothing in this section authorizes a certified nurse-midwife, a nurse

1//

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

11. 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:

(g) Knowingly making or signing any certificate or other document that falsely represents the existence or nonexistence of a state of facts.

(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.

12

13

14

(j) The violation of any of the statutes of this state, or any other state, or of the United States regulating controlled substances and dangerous drugs.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

(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....

2223

24

25

26

12.

27

28

(b) When considering the suspension or revocation of a facility or a personal

Title 16, of the Code of Regulations, section 1769, subdivision (b) sets forth the

following factors to consider with regard to evidence of rehabilitation:

of violation, the date, circumstances, location and the complete penalty received. In her explanation to the Board, Respondent stated:

I received a misdemeanor charge for D.U.I. on October 4, 2002. I completed all the required classes and paid all associated fines. My [driver's] license was not suspended because the judge ruled in my favor against the police. I have never been in trouble before or after this incident. My life is on track and going great. My biggest concern has now become my career. Please don't let this six year old mistake get in the way of my future.

- 18. Respondent's application for licensure was not formally investigated and the details of the DUI charge of October 4, 2002 were not known by the Board. Those details follow.
- 19. On or about February 23, 2003, in *The People of the State of California v. Christina Ivy Moreland*, Riverside Superior Court, Case No. RIM424692, Respondent was convicted on her guilty plea of violation of Vehicle Code Section 23152(b), driving under the influence of alcohol with a blood alcohol content of 0.08% or greater. Breath tests at the incident scene indicated Respondent's blood alcohol content was 0.17%. Contrary to Respondent's statement to the Board, as a result of the conviction Respondent was sentenced to 36 months probation, ordered to pay fines and fees of \$1552.00, attend a First Offender DUI program, and her license was restricted for a period of 3 months, except travel to/from work, within the scope of her employment and to/from an alcohol treatment program.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(April 22, 2010 Conviction of Possession of a Controlled Substance on January 23, 2010)

- 20. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 482, 490 and 4301, subdivision (l), for conviction of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a pharmacy technician. The circumstances are as follows.
- 21. On or about April 22, 2010, in *The People of the State of California v. Christina Ivy Moreland, Riverside Superior Court*, Case No. RIM10003717, Respondent was convicted on her guilty plea to violation of Health and Safety Code 11357(b), possession of less than 1 ounce of marijuana, a misdemeanor.
 - 22. As a result of the conviction, Respondent was ordered to pay a \$160 fine.

23. The circumstances that led to the conviction are as follows. On January 23, 2010, at about 0430 hours, an officer of the Corona Police Department observed a vehicle traveling at a speed of 50 mph in a 40 mph zone. Because of the fog in the area, the officer conducted a traffic stop. Upon contacting Respondent, the officer smelled a strong odor of perfume coming from the interior of the vehicle. With the smell of perfume, the officer could also smell what the officer believed to be marijuana. When asked whether she had anything illegal in the car, Respondent stated that she did not. Respondent consented to a search of her vehicle. During the search of the vehicle, the officer found a green plastic bottle underneath the driver's seat. Inside the bottle was a green, leafy substance believed to be marijuana. Respondent stated the bottle contained "weed". She denied having a prescription for marijuana. Respondent was cited for violation of Health and Safety Code section 11357(b). At the police station, the officer weighed the marijuana. It weighed 4 grams. The officer tested it with the NARK test kit, which returned a positive result for marijuana.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct-Violation of Law Regarding Possession on January 23, 2010)

24. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (j), in conjunction with section 4060, for unprofessional conduct in violating the laws of this state in that Respondent violated the laws of the state of California when she possessed a controlled substance, marijuana, without a prescription, as set forth more fully in paragraphs 20-23, above, and incorporated by this reference as though set forth in full herein.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct-Violation of Law Regarding Furnishing on January 23, 2010)

25. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (j), in conjunction with section 4059, subdivision (a), for unprofessional conduct in violating the laws of this state in that Respondent violated the laws of the state of California when she furnished a dangerous drug, marijuana, to herself, without a prescription, as set forth more fully in paragraphs 20-23, above, and incorporated by this reference as though set forth in full herein.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Self-Administration of Controlled Substance on September 16, 2009)

- 26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (h) for unprofessional conduct in administering a controlled substance to herself to the extent or in a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to herself or to any other person or to the public. The circumstances are as follows.
- 27. On or about September 16, 2009, at 0332 hours, an officer of the California Highway Patrol made a traffic stop after observing that Respondent's vehicle was traveling at a speed of 80 mph on SR-91. When the officer made contact with Respondent through an open window, the officer smelled the strong odor of marijuana coming from the vehicle. The officer asked Respondent how long it had been since she smoked last and Respondent replied, "Way, way earlier today." The officer observed that Respondent's eyes were red. Respondent told the officer that she just got off of work at a pharmacy. Respondent denied having any marijuana in her car.
- 28. The officer asked Respondent where and when she last smoked marijuana. Respondent stated she last smoked marijuana at her friend's house and then went to work. She admitted that she did not have a medical marijuana card. When asked why she smoked marijuana, Respondent stated it was to "have a good day at work." Respondent explained that she had a stressful job and marijuana makes her relax. She claims that she did not smoke marijuana very often, just every other day.
- 29. The officer then asked Respondent to perform field sobriety tests, which Respondent failed. Respondent then admitted that she had smoke some marijuana during her lunch break at 2200 hours. The officer determined that Respondent was under the influence of marijuana and was unable to safely operate a motor vehicle based upon his observations of her driving, her admissions regarding smoking marijuana, her display of objective symptoms of drug impairment, her rapid pulse, her unsteady gait, her yellow coated tongue, her poor performance of the field sobriety tests and his training and experience.
- 30. A search of Respondent's vehicle also revealed three empty, orange plastic prescription bottles in the glove compartment with the labels removed, a glass pipe with burnt

marijuana residue and a white metal marijuana pipe with burnt marijuana residue, both in the glove compartment. A glass pipe containing burnt marijuana residue was found in the center console. Under the driver's seat, loose marijuana lying on the floorboard next to a glass pipe filled with unburnt marijuana and burnt marijuana residue were found.

31. A Drug Influence Evaluation was performed of Respondent at the CHP office. It was determined that Respondent was under the influence of a combination of a central nervous system depressant and Cannabis and was unable to safely operate a vehicle.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct-Violation of Law Regarding Furnishing on September 16, 2009)

32. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (j), in conjunction with section 4059, subdivision (a), for unprofessional conduct in violating the laws of this state in that Respondent violated the laws of the state of California when she furnished a dangerous drug, marijuana, to herself, without a prescription, as set forth more fully in paragraphs 26-31, above, and incorporated by this reference as though set forth in full herein.

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

- 33. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, Complainant alleges the following under title 16, California Code of Regulations, section 1769(b)(2):
- a. On February 25, 2003, in *The People of the State of California vs. Christina Ivy Moreland*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIM424692, Respondent was convicted on her guilty plea of violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(b), driving under the influence of alcohol with a blood alcohol content of 0.08% or higher.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:

1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician Registration Number TCH 86174, issued to Christina Ivy Moreland;