1				
.2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	41	RE THE		
9	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS			
_	STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
10		_		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 5125		
12				
13	SANGEETA DEVI REDDY  DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER			
14	15538 Dearborn Street North Hills, CA 91343	DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER		
15	Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH	[Gov. Code, §11520]		
16	81735			
17				
18	Respondent.			
19				
20	FINDING	FINDINGS OF FACT		
21	1. On or about September 14, 2014, Co	mplainant Virginia Herold, in her official		
22	capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs,			
23	filed Accusation No. 5125 against Sangeeta Devi Reddy (Respondent) before the Board of			
24	Pharmacy. (Accusation attached as Exhibit A.)			
25	2. On or about February 15, 2008, the Board of Pharmacy (Board) issued Pharmacy			
26	Technician Registration No. TCH 81735 to Respondent. The Pharmacy Technician Registration			
27	was in full force and effect at all times relevant t	o the charges brought in Accusation No. 5125		
28	and will expire on January 31, 2016, unless renewed.			
		4		

3. On or about September 24, 2014, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Accusation No. 5125, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4100, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board. Respondent's address of record was and is:

15538 Dearborn Street North Hills, CA 91343.

- 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. 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.
- 6. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of the Accusation, and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 5125.
  - 7. 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.
- 8. 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. 5125, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 5125, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.

1	9. Taking official notice of its own internal records, pursuant to Business and
2	Professions Code section 125.3, it is hereby determined that the reasonable costs for Investigation
3	and Enforcement is \$1,560.00 as of November 18, 2014.
4	<u>DETERMINATION OF ISSUES</u>
5	1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Sangeeta Devi Reddy has
6	subjected her Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 81735 to discipline.
7	2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
8	3. The Board of Pharmacy is authorized to revoke Respondent's Pharmacy Technician
9	Registration based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation which are supported
10	by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this case:
1	a. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code
12	sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (l), in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title
13	16, section 1770, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct, in that on or about October 17, 2014
۱4	Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 484 (a)
15	[theft of personal property], a crime substantially related to the practice of a pharmacy technician
16	b. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code
17	sections 4300 and 4301, subdivision (f), on the grounds of unprofessional conduct, for
18	committing acts involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption.
19	c. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code
20	section 4301 and / or 4301, subdivision (o), for committing acts of unprofessional conduct and /
21	or acts violating the Pharmacy Law.
22	///
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	1//
28	

1	<u>ORDER</u>		
2	IT IS SO ORDERED that Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 81735, heretofore		
3	ssued to Respondent Sangeeta Devi Reddy, is revoked.		
4	Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a		
5	written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within		
6	seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may		
7	vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.		
8	This Decision shall become effective on February 6, 2015.		
9	It is so ORDERED January 7, 2015.		
10	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
11	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
12	By G. Wussi		
13	STAN C. WEISSER  Board President		
14	Bodig Tesidon		
15	51644427, DOC DOJ Matter ID:LA2014511279		
16			
17	Exhibit A: Accusation		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

Exhibit A

Accusation

1	KAMALA D. HARRIS					
. 2						
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General M. Travis Peery Deputy Attorney General					
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 261887					
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013					
6	Telephone: (213) 897-0962 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804					
. 7	Attorneys for Complainant					
8	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY					
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
10						
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. 5125					
12	SANGEETA DEVI REDDY 15538 Dearborn Street					
13	North Hills, CA 91343  ACCUSATION					
14	Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 81735					
15	Respondent.					
16						
17						
18	Complainant alleges:					
19	PARTIES					
20	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity					
21	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board).					
22	2. On or about February 15, 2008, the Board issued Pharmacy Technician Registration					
23	No. TCH 81735 to Sangeeta Devi Reddy (Respondent). The Pharmacy Technician Registration					
24	was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on					
25	January 31, 2016, unless renewed.					
26	<u>JURISDICTION</u>					
27	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following					
28	laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.					
	1					
	Accusation					

- 4. Section 4300 states (a), states that "[e]very license issued may be suspended or revoked."
- 5. Section 118, subdivision (b), provides that the suspension, expiration, surrender or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.

## STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 6. Section 490 states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) In addition to any other action that a board is permitted to take against a licensee, a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.
- "(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a board may exercise any authority to discipline a licensee for conviction of a crime that is independent of the authority granted under subdivision (a) only if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the licensee's license was issued.
- "(c) 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...."
  - 7. Section 4301 states, in pertinent part:

"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:

27 | ///

28 | 1//

4

5

7

10

15 16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24 25

26

27

28

"(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.

The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and "(1) 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

"(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. . . . "

111 111

indictment.

# 

#### **REGULATORY PROVISION**

3. 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,"

#### COST RECOVERY

9. Section 125.3 provides 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.

#### FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Conviction of a Substantially Related Crime)

- 10. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (1), in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct, in that Respondent was convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a licensee which to a substantial degree evidences her present or potential unfitness to perform the functions authorized by her license in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare, as follows:
- a. On or about October 17, 2013, after pleading nolo contendere, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code Section 484 (a) [theft of personal property] in the criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California v. Sangeeta Devi Reddy* (Super. Ct. L.A. County, 2013, No. 3SR04266). The Court sentenced Respondent to one day in jail, placed her on 36 months probation, ordered her to pay \$2,119.48 in restitution, and ordered her to stay away from all CVS stores.

III

b. The circumstances underlying the conviction are that on or about August 26, 2013, Respondent admitted to Los Angeles Police Department officers that, while working as a Pharmacy Technician for CVS in Granada Hills, she used the Pharmacist's and her own employee ID numbers to fraudulently ring up non receipted returns and take the refund money. Respondent admitted to the officers that she had been engaging in this fraudulent activity for over a year.

### SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Acts Involving Moral Turpitude, Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit or Corruption)

11. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section under 4300, and 4301, subdivision (f), on the grounds of unprofessional conduct, in that on or about August 26, 2013, Respondent committed acts involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption. Complainant refers to and by this reference incorporates the allegations set forth above in paragraph 10, subparagraphs a and b, inclusive, as though set forth fully.

#### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct/ Violate Pharmacy Law)

12. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301 and / or 4301, subdivision (o), in that Respondent committed acts of unprofessional conduct, and / or acts violating the Pharmacy Law. Complainant refers to and by this reference incorporates the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 10 and 11, inclusive, as though set forth fully.

# <u>PRÁYER</u>

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

- Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician Registration Number TCH 81735,
   issued to Sangeeta Devi Reddy;
- 2. Ordering Sangeeta Devi Reddy to pay the Board the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to section 125.3; and

26 1 ///

27 1///

28 | ///

DATED	3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.  DATED:  ORDER OF THE PROPERTY OF THE		
LA20145	11279 ),doc		
			•
	•		
	•		
			·
	•	•	
		•	
			, .
∦ 、		6	