Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4100 and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1704, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board. Respondent's address of record was and is:

12686 Kestrel Street San Diego, CA 92129

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions Code section 124.
- 5. On or about April 25, 2014, the Domestic Return Receipt for the aforementioned documents served by Certified Mail was signed indicating service of the Accusation.
 - 6. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
 - (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.
- 7. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 4985.
 - 8. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
 - (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.
- 9. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this matter, as well as taking official notice of all the investigatory reports, exhibits and statements contained therein on file at the Board's offices regarding the allegations contained in Accusation No. 4985, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 4985, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.

Taking official notice of its own internal records, pursuant to Business and 10. Professions Code section 125.3, it is hereby determined that the reasonable costs for Investigation and Enforcement is \$642.50 as of May 27, 2014.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent David Anthony White has subjected his Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 11147 to discipline.
 - 2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 3. The Board of Pharmacy is authorized to revoke Respondent's Pharmacy Technician Registration based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the Default Decision Investigatory Evidence Packet in this case:
- Respondent has subjected his registration to discipline under section 4301, subdivision (j) of the Code in that he illegally possessed hydrocodone on or about June 25, 2013, June 30, 2013, and July 20, 2013, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11350, subdivision (a), Title 21 U.S.C. section 843, subdivision (a)(3), Board of Pharmacy Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1700, et seq.), and the California Uniform Controlled Substances Act (Health and Safety Code 11000, et seq.).
- b. Respondent has subjected his registration to discipline under section 4301, subdivision (f) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that Respondent stole controlled substances from his employer using dishonesty, fraud and deceit.
- Respondent has subjected his registration to discipline under section 4301, c. subdivision (o) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that on or about June 25, 2013, June 30, 2013, and July 20, 2013, Respondent violated Business and Professions Code sections 4059 and 4060, when he illegally furnished to himself and possessed controlled substances.

111

111

26 ///

27

28

ORDER IT IS SO ORDERED that Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 11147, heretofore issued to Respondent David Anthony White, is revoked. Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute. This Decision shall become effective on August 1, 2014. It is so ORDERED July 2, 2014 BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA STAN C. WEISSER **Board President** DOJ Matter ID: SD2013706257 Attachment: Exhibit A: Accusation

Exhibit A

Accusation

1 2	Kamala D. Harris Attorney General of California Linda K. Schneider	
	Supervising Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 101336	
3	Amanda Dodds	
4	Senior Legal Analyst 110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100	
5	San Diego, CA 92101 P.O. Box 85266	
6	San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 645-2141	
7	Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant	
8		·
9	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY	
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11		
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 4985
13	DAVID ANTHONY WHITE 12686 Kestrel Street	ACCUSATION
14	San Diego, CA 92129	
15	Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 11147	
16	Respondent.	
17	TC	
18		
19	Complainant alleges:	
20	PART	TIES
21	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity	
22	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.	
23	2. On or about December 23, 1993, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician	
24	Registration Number TCH 11147 to David Anthony White (Respondent). The Pharmacy	
25	Technician Registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought	
26	herein and will expire on May 31, 2015, unless renewed.	
27	111	
28	111	
	1	Accusation

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation 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 (a) of the Code states "Every license issued may be suspended or revoked."

5. Section 4300.1 of the Code states:

The expiration, cancellation, forfeiture, or suspension of a board-issued license by operation of law or by order or decision of the board or a court of law, the placement of a license on a retired status, or the voluntary surrender of a license by a licensee shall not deprive the board of jurisdiction to commence or proceed with any investigation of, or action or disciplinary proceeding against, the licensee or to render a decision suspending or revoking the license.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

6. Section 492 of the Code states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, successful completion of any diversion program under the Penal Code, or successful completion of an alcohol and drug problem assessment program under Article 5 (commencing with section 23249.50) of Chapter 12 of Division 11 of the Vehicle Code, shall not prohibit any agency established under Division 2 ([Healing Arts] commencing with Section 500) of this code, or any initiative act referred to in that division, from taking disciplinary action against a licensee or from denying a license for professional misconduct, notwithstanding that evidence of that misconduct may be recorded in a record pertaining to an arrest.

This section shall not be construed to apply to any drug diversion program operated by any agency established under Division 2 (commencing with Section 500) of this code, or any initiative act referred to in that division.

7. Section 4022 of the Code states

"Dangerous drug" or "dangerous device" means any drug or device unsafe for self-use in humans or animals, and includes the following:

- (a) Any drug that bears the legend: "Caution: federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription," "Rx only," or words of similar import.
- (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 import, the blank to be filled in with the designation of the practitioner licensed to use or order use of the device.
- (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.

Accusation

III

12. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1769, states:

(b) When considering the suspension or revocation of a facility or a personal license on the ground that the licensee or the registrant has been convicted of a crime, the board, in evaluating the rehabilitation of such person and his present eligibility for a license will consider the following criteria:

- (1) Nature and severity of the act(s) or offense(s).
- (2) Total criminal record.
- (3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s).
- (4) Whether the licensee has complied with all terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the licensee.
 - (5) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the licensee.
- 13. 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.

COSTS

14. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, 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, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be included in a stipulated settlement.

DRUG

15. Hydrocodone/APAP, sold commercially as Norco, is a Schedule III controlled substance as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11056, subdivision (e)(4), and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. On or about August 1, 2013, the Regional Loss Prevention Manager for CVS Pharmacy met with a Task Force Officer (TFO) with the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) regarding the suspected theft of Norco from one of its San Diego pharmacies. The missing Norco was discovered during an audit on May 16, 2013. The timeframe of the audit included dates between October 7, 2012 and May 15, 2013. From that point forward, the CVS pharmacy conducted a daily count of its inventory.
- 17. Respondent's pharmacy technician registration expired on May 31, 2013, and CVS assigned him to cashier duty. He was directed not to handle or dispense medications until his registration was reinstated.
- 18. On June 9, 2013, CVS installed covert surveillance cameras in the pharmacy to monitor its activities. From May 29, 2013 to June 24, 2013, no loss of Norco was recorded. On the same day Respondent's pharmacy technician registration was reinstated, on June 26, 2013, the pharmacy's inventory count showed a loss of 100 tablets of Norco from the previous day. Surveillance cameras captured video on June 25, 2013 wherein Respondent was recorded taking a bottle of Norco from the main shelving unit (a.k.a. "end cap") and walking out of view. Respondent was not authorized to be in the pharmacy because his registration was not valid. The daily inventory revealed that no Norco had been dispensed on June 25, 2013.
- 19. In an inventory count conducted on July 1, 2013, a shortage of 160 tablets of Norco was reported between June 28 and July 1. On June 30, 2013, closed circuit surveillance video showed Respondent selecting a bottle of Norco from the end cap and walking out of the cameras' view. The daily inventory revealed that no Norco had been dispensed on June 30, 2013.
- 20. On July 20, 2013, a shortage of 120 tablets of Norco was reported. The missing tablets were from a "returned to stock" bottle for a prescription that had been filled on July 19, 2013. The Pharmacy Manager stated that she saw the bottle of Norco on the end cap, but only noticed it missing after Respondent's shift ended and he had left the pharmacy. A review of the covert video surveillance showed Respondent taking the bottle of Norco and turning away from the camera. When he turned back to the camera, the bottle was gone. The daily inventory report

///

for July 20, 2013 showed that 150 tablets of Norco had been dispensed and witnessed by the Pharmacy Manager.

- 21. Based on its investigation, CVS estimated that between October 7, 2012 and July 24, 2013, 3,473 tablets of Norco, with an estimated value of \$2,709.00, had gone missing. On or about August 2, 2013, the Regional Loss Prevention Manager for CVS attempted to conduct an interview with Respondent when he arrived for his shift. Respondent was uncooperative and tried to leave the store, but he was intercepted and arrested by the DEA.
- 22. As a result of the arrest, on or about August 6, 2013, a felony complaint was filed in San Diego County Superior Court, case number CD249864, charging Respondent with three counts of violating Health and Safety Code section, 11350, subdivision (a), possession of a controlled substance, to wit, hydrocodone; Penal Code section 508, embezzlement by a clerk/agent/servant; and Penal Code section 484, petty theft.
- 23. On or about October 2, 2013, Respondent entered a plea of guilty to one count of violating Health and Safety Code section 11350, subdivision (a). The court deferred entry of judgment for 18 months, and Respondent was ordered to enroll in a substance abuse treatment program. The remaining counts were dismissed by the court pursuant to the plea agreement.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Violation of Statutes Regulating Controlled Substances)

	24.	Respondent has subjected his registration to discipline under section 4301,
subo	livision	(j) of the Code in that he illegally possessed hydrocodone on or about June 25, 2013,
June	30, 20	13, and July 20, 2013, as described in paragraphs 16-21, above, a violation of Health
and	Safety	Code section 11350, subdivision (a), Title 21 U.S.C. section 843, subdivision (a)(3),
Boa	rd of Pl	narmacy Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 1700, et seq.),
and	the Cal	ifornia Uniform Controlled Substances Act (Health and Safety Code 11000, et seq.).
///		
///		

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Commission of Acts Involving Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit & Corruption)

25. Respondent has subjected his registration to discipline under section 4301, subdivision (f) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that Respondent stole controlled substances from his employer using dishonesty, fraud and deceit, as described in paragraphs 16-21, above.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Violating Federal & State Laws & Regulations Governing Pharmacy)

26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (o) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that on or about June 25, 2013, June 30, 2013, and July 20, 2013, Respondent violated Business and Professions Code sections 4059 and 4060, when he illegally furnished to himself and possessed controlled substances, as described in paragraphs 16-21, above.

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

- 27. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1769, Complainant alleges:
- a. On or about March 15, 2012, at approximately two o'clock in the morning, a patrol deputy with the San Diego County Sheriff's Department observed Respondent drive past him at a high rate of speed. After conducting a traffic stop, the deputy made contact with Respondent and observed an odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from Respondent, his eyes were red and watery, and he admitted to consuming alcohol earlier in the evening. Respondent submitted to a series of field sobriety tests which indicated impairment. Respondent provided two breath samples which were analyzed with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of .104 and .096, respectively. Respondent was arrested for driving under the influence. Two additional breath samples submitted during booking were tested with a BAC of .10 and .098 percent.
- b. As a result of the arrest, on or about April 26, 2012, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People of the State of California v. David Anthony White*, in San Diego County Superior Court, case number M148523, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty of violating

2

Vehicle Code section 23103, alcohol-related reckless driving, a misdemeanor, a count substituted for the original charges of driving under the influence of alcohol (Veh. Code, § 23152(a)), and driving with a BAC of .08 percent or more (Veh. Code, § 23152(b)), pursuant to Vehicle Code section 23103.5, subdivision (a).

As a result of the conviction, on or about July 27, 2012, the Board issued Citation number CI 2011 51800 to Respondent. The Citation alleged that Respondent's unprofessional conduct violated Business and Professions Code section 4301, subdivision (h) in that he used an alcoholic beverage to a dangerous extent; and section 4301, subdivision (l), in that he was convicted of a crime substantially related to the practice of pharmacy. Respondent was assessed a fine in the amount of \$150.

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:

- Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician Registration Number TCH 11147, 1. issued to David Anthony White;
- Ordering David Anthony White to pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable costs of 2. the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;
 - Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 3.

DATED: 4/9/14

Executive Officer

Board of Pharmacy

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California Complainant

SD2013706257