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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

COSTCO CORP. DBA COSTCO PHARMACY #454 115 Technology Drive Irvine, CA 92618

Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 41247

LAURA CODY MORRIS 215 Deinenger Circle Corona, CA 92880

Pharmacist License No. RPH 46609

Case No. 5324

OAH No. 2015081057

STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER FOR PUBLIC REPROVAL (LAURA CODY MORRIS)

Respondents.

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval is

hereby adopted by the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs, as its Decision

in this matter.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on September 23, 2016.

It is so ORDERED on August 24, 2016.

BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Bу

Amy Gutierrez, Pharm.D. Board President California State Board of Pharmacy 1625 N. Market Blvd, N219, Sacramento, CA 95834 Phone: (916) 574-7900 Fax: (916) 574-8618 www.pharmacy.ca.gov

August 24, 2016

Laura Cody Morris 215 Deinenger Circle Corona, CA 92880

Re: LETTER OF PUBLIC REPROVAL In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Laura Cody Morris, et al., Pharmacist License No. RPH 46609

Dear Ms. Morris:

On April 13, 2015, the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California, filed an Accusation against your Pharmacist License. The Accusation alleged that you engaged in unprofessional conduct as follows:

(1) When you failed to comply with your corresponding responsibility to ensure that controlled substances were dispensed for a legitimate medical purpose in violation of Health & Safety Code section 11153(a).

(2) When you dispensed controlled substance prescriptions with significant errors, omissions, irregularities, uncertainties, ambiguities or alterations in violation of California Code of Regulations, title 16, sections 1761(a) and (b).

(3) When you engaged in the activities set forth above in violation of Business and Professions Code section 4301.

Accordingly, in resolution of this matter under the authority provided under Business and Professions Code section 495, the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs issues this letter of public reproval.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA HEROLD

Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy Department of Consumer Affairs

	1			
1	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California			
2	GREGORY J. SALUTE Supervising Deputy Attorney General			
3	DESIREE I. KELLOGG			
. 4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 126461			
5	600 West Broadway, Suite 1800 San Diego, CA 92101			
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266			
	Telephone: (619) 645-2996			
7	Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant			
8		RETHE		
9	BOARD OF	PHARMACY		
10		CONSUMER AFFAIRS CALIFORNIA		
11				
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 5324		
	COSTCO CORP. DBA COSTCO	OAH No. 2015081057		
13	PHARMACY #454 115 Technology Drive	STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND		
14	Irvine, CA 92618	DISCIPLINARY ORDER FOR PUBLIC		
15	Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 41247	REPROVAL (LAURA CODY MORRIS)		
16	LAURA CODY MORRIS	[Bus. & Prof. Code § 495]		
· 17	215 Deinenger Circle Corona, CA 92880			
18	Pharmacist License No. RPH 46609			
19		·		
	Respondents.			
20				
21	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties to the above-			
22	22 entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:			
23				
24	l l	TIES		
25	1. VIRGINIA HEROLD (Complainant) is the Executive Officer of the Board of			
. 26	Pharmacy. She brought this action solely in her	official capacity and is represented in this matter		
	by Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General of the State of California, by Desiree I. Kellogg, Deputy			
27	Attorney General.			
28				
	<u> </u>	1 .		
		STIPULATED SETTLEMENT (5324)		

2. Respondent Costco Corp. dba Costco Pharmacy #454 (Respondent) is represented in 1 this proceeding by attorneys Helaine W. Heydemann and Brandie Gasper of Locke Lord LLP, 2 whose address is: 111 South Wacker Drive, Chicago, IL 60606 and 300 South Grand Avenue, 3 Suite 2600, Los Angeles, CA 90071. 4 5

On or about November 12, 1995, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Permit No. 3. PHY 41247 to Costco Corp. dba Costco Pharmacy #454. The Pharmacy Permit was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 5324 and will expire on October 1, 2016, unless renewed.

On or about August 19, 1993, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License 4. 9 Number RPH 46609 to Laura Cody Morris (Respondent). The Pharmacist License was in full 10 force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on June 30, 11 2017, unless renewed. 12

JURISDICTION

Accusation No. 5324 was filed before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of 5. 14 Consumer Affairs and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other 15 16 statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on April 13, 2015. Respondent timely filed her Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation 17 No. 5324 is attached as exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference. 18

19

21

6

7

8

13

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

б. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the 20 charges and allegations in Accusation No. 5324. Respondent has also carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary 22 23 Order for Public Reproval.

Respondent is fully aware of her legal rights in this matter, including the right to a 24 7. hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to confront and cross-examine 25 the witnesses against her; the right to present evidence and to testify on her own behalf; the right 26 27 to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of

2

documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.

8. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

9. Respondent understands and agrees that the charges and allegations in Accusation
 No. 5324, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon her Pharmacist
 License.

9 10. For the purpose of resolving the Accusation without the expense and uncertainty of 10 further proceedings, Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could establish a factual 11 basis for the charges in the Accusation, and that Respondent hereby gives up its right to contest 12 those charges.

13 11. Respondent agrees that her Pharmacist License is subject to discipline and they agree
to be bound by the Disciplinary Order below.

CONTINGENCY

12. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Board of Pharmacy. Respondent 16 understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Board of Pharmacy may 17 communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation and settlement, without notice to 18 19 or participation by Respondent or her counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that she may not withdraw its agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation 20 prior to the time the Board considers and acts upon it. If the Board fails to adopt this stipulation 21as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval 22 ·23 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 24 considered this matter. 25

26 13. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile
27 copies of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval, including

28

· 1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

15

3 ·

Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14. This Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval 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 Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval may not be altered, amended, modified, supplemented, or otherwise changed except by a writing executed by an authorized representative of each of the parties.

10 15. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that
11 the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following
12 Disciplinary Order:

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Pharmacist License No. RPH 46609 issued to Respondent
Laura Cody Morris (Respondent) shall be publicly reproved by the Board of Pharmacy under
Business and Professions Code section 495. The letter issued to Respondent shall be in
substantially the same form as the letter attached as Exhibit B to this stipulation.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall comply with terms and conditions as
19 set for the below. Any violation of the terms and conditions shall constitute unprofessional
20 conduct and grounds for further disciplinary action.

1 Within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this decision, Respondent shall 21 22submit to the Board or its designee, for prior approval, an appropriate program of remedial education related to corresponding responsibility (preferably the remedial education course which 23 Costco Corporation's Pharmacy Regional Managers will be taking). The program of remedial 24 education shall consist of at least six (6) hours, which shall be completed in-person and within 25 one (1) year of the effective date of this decision, at Respondent's or her employer's expense. 2.6Failure to timely submit or complete the approved remedial education shall be considered a 27 violation of this agreement. Respondent shall submit written proof in a form acceptable to the 28

1	board, of such successful completion of remedial education to the board or its designee.		
2.	ACCEPTANCE		
3	I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public		
4.	Reproval and have fully discussed it with my attorneys, Helaine W. Heydemann and Brandie		
\$°	Gasper. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Pharmacist License. I enter		
б	into this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval voluntarily,		
7'	knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Board of		
8	Pharmacy.		
9			
0	DATED: 6/16/16 - Coly Comis		
ļ	LAURA CODY MORRIS Respondent		
2	I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Laura Cody Morris the terms and		
3,	conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Orde		
4	for Public Reproval. I approve its form and content.		
5,	DATED: 6/17/2016 Velaine Hujdemann		
6	HELAINE W. HEWDEMANN Attorney for Respondent		
7			
8			
8 9 0			
9 0			
9 0 1			
9 0 1 2			
9 0 1 2 3.			
9 0 1 2 3.			
9 0 1 2 3 4 5			
9 0 1 2 3. 4 5 5			
9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7			
9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	5		

ĩ0

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Board of Pharmacy of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

6/17/16 DATED:

.19

. 25

SD2014708110 81337078.doc Respectfully submitted,

KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California GREGORY L SALUTE Supervising Deputy Attorney General

STIPULATED SETTLEMENT (5324)

DESIREE I. KELLOGG Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 5324

¥.

		· · · ·	
	Kamala D. Harris		
	Attorney General of California		
2	GREGORY J. SALUTE Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
3	DESIREE I. KELLOGG Deputy Attorney General	•	
4	State Bar No. 126461 110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100		
5	San Diego, CA 92101 ' P.O. Box 85266		
6	San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 645-2996		
7	Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant		
8		RE THE	
9	BOARD OF 1	PHARMACY ONSUMER AFFAIRS	
10		CALIFORNIA	
11			
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 5324	
13	COSTCO CORP. DBA COSTCO PHARMACY #454		
14	115 Technology Drive Irvine, CA 92618	ACCUSATION	
15	Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 41247		
16	LAURA CODY MORRIS		
17	2900 Bakers St. Costa Mesa, CA		
18	Pharmacist License No. RPH 46609		
· 19	Respondents.		
20			
21			
22	Complainant alleges:		
23	PA	RTIES	. 1
24	1, Virginia Herold (Complainant) brir	ngs this Accusation solely in her official capac	sity
25	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharm	acy, Department of Consumer Affairs.	
26	2. On or about November 12, 1995, th	ne Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Perm	it
27	Number PHY 41247 to Costco Corp., doing bu	isiness as Costco Pharmacy #454 (Responden	.t
28			
		1	
		Act	cusation

ļ

1	Costco Pharmacy). The Pharmacy Permit was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the	
2	charges brought herein and will expire on October 1, 2015, unless renewed.	
3	. 3. On or about August 19, 1993, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License	
4	Number RPH 46609 to Laura Cody Morris (Respondent Laura Cody Morris). The Pharmacist	
5	License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will	
6	expire on June 30, 2015, unless renewed.	
7	JURISDICTION	
8	4. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of	
9	Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the	
10	Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.	
11	5. Section 4011 of the Code provides that the Board shall administer and enforce both	
12	the Pharmacy Law [Bus, & Prof. Code, § 4000 et seq.] and the Uniform Controlled Substances	
13	Act [Health & Safety Code, § 11000 et seq.].	
14	6. Section 4300(a) of the Code provides that every license issued by the Board may be	
15	suspended or revoked.	
16	7. Section 4300.1 of the Code states:	
17	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	
18	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	
19	investigation of, or action or disciplinary proceeding against, the licensee or to render	
20	a decision suspending or revoking the license. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS	
<i>,</i> 21	8. Section 4301 of the Code states in pertinent part:	
22		
23	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	
24	misrepresentation or issued by mistake. Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:	
25		
26	(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	
27	Onned States regulating conducted substances and dangerous drugs	
28		
	2	
	Accusation	

Æ.

(0) 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 any other state or federal regulatory agency.

9. Section 4113(c) of the Code states:

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The pharmacist-in-charge shall be responsible for a pharmacy's compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to the practice of pharmacy.

10. Health and Safety Code section 11153(a) states:

A prescription for a controlled substance shall only be issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner acting in the usual course of his or her professional practice. The responsibility for the proper prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances is upon the prescribing practitioner, but a corresponding responsibility rests with the pharmacist who fills the prescription. Except as authorized by this division, the following are not legal prescriptions: (1) an order purporting to be a prescription which is issued not in the usual course of professional treatment or in legitimate and authorized research; or (2) an order for an addict or habitual user of controlled substances, which is issued not in the course of professional treatment or as part of an authorized narcotic treatment program, for the purpose of providing the user with controlled substances, sufficient to keep him or her comfortable by maintaining customary use.

11. Section 1707.3 of title 16, California Code of Regulations states:

Prior to consultation as set forth in section 1707.2, a pharmacist shall review a patient's drug therapy and medication record before each prescription drug is delivered. The review shall include screening for severe potential drug therapy problems.

12. Section 1761 of title 16, California Code of Regulations states:

(a) No pharmacist shall compound or dispense any prescription which contains any significant error, omission, irregularity, uncertainty, ambiguity or alteration. Upon receipt of any such prescription, the pharmacist shall contact the prescriber to obtain the information needed to validate the prescription.

(b) Even after conferring with the prescriber, a pharmacist shall not compound or dispense a controlled substance prescription where the pharmacist knows or has objective reason to know that said prescription was not issued for a legitimate medical purpose.

3

1	COST RECOVERY	
2	13. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the	
3	administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of	
4	the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and	
5	enforcement of the case.	
6	DRUGS	
7	14. <u>Ambien</u> is the brand name for zolpidem, a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant	
8	to Health and Safety Code section 11057(d) and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and	
9	Professions Code section 4022.	
10	15. <u>Klonopin</u> is the brand name for clonazepam, a Schedule IV controlled substance	
11	pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11057(b)(7) and a dangerous drug pursuant to	
12	Business and Professions Code section 4022.	
13	16. <u>MS Contin</u> is the brand name for morphine sulfate, a Schedule II controlled substance	
14	pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11055(b)(1)(L) and a dangerous drug pursuant to	
15	Business and Professions Code section 4022.	
16	17. <u>Oxycontin</u> and <u>OxyIR</u> are brand names for oxycodone or oxycodone ER respectively	
17	and are Schedule II controlled substances pursuant to Health and Safety Code section	
18	11055(b)(1)(M) and dangerous drugs pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.	
19	18. <u>Percocet</u> is the brand name for acetaminophen/oxycodone, a Schedule II controlled	
20	substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11055(b)(1)(L) and a dangerous drug	
21	pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.	
22	19. <u>Soma</u> is the brand name for carisporodol, a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant	
23	to Health and Safety Code section 11055(b)(1)(L) and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and	
24	Professions Code section 4022.	
25	20. <u>Vicodin/Norco</u> is the brand name for acetaminophen/hydrocodone, a Schedule III	
26	controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11056(e)(5) and a dangerous	
27	drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.	
28		
	4	
	Accusation	

li

21. Xanax is the brand name for alprazolam, a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11057(d)(1) and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

22. From November 17, 1995 through February 21, 2014, Respondent Laura Morris was the Pharmacist-in-Charge of Respondent Costco Pharmacy.

23. Effective 2000 through October 2009, Respondent Costco Pharmacy implemented a policy setting forth the parameters for its pharmacists to dispense controlled substances to patients. This policy and procedure provided that Respondent Costco Pharmacy could only support its pharmacist's decision to decline to fill a prescription for controlled substances if it was "based on sound medical reasoning and the appropriate communication with the prescriber and the patient has occurred."

24. Effective November 28, 2009 through July 11, 2012, Respondent Costco Pharmacy 13 implemented a revised policy and procedure setting forth the parameters for its pharmacists to 14 dispense controlled substances to patients. This policy and procedure provided that Respondent 15 Costco Pharmacy would only support a pharmacist's decision to deny filling a prescription for 16 17 controlled substances if that decision was reviewed and approved by a Regional Pharmacy Supervisor. The policy and procedure further provided that "only in extreme cases and only upon 18 collaboration with your Regional Pharmacy Supervisor will refusal of pharmacy service be 19 considered...Prior to refusing to fill a prescription OR denying any immediate or future pharmacy 20 service for suspicion of fraud, the pharmacist on duty or pharmacy manager must contact the 21Regional Pharmacy Supervisor... There must be no doubt that a prescription is fraudulent prior to 22 taking any action or refusing pharmacy service and then only with the proper approvals... If need 23 be, dispense enough of the medication until the prescriber can be contacted to confirm fraud." 24

25 25. Effective July 12, 2012 through June 3, 2013, Respondent Costco Pharmacy
26 implemented a revised policy and procedure (Controlled Substance Dispensing Policy) setting
27 forth the parameters for its pharmacists to dispense controlled substances to patients. The revised
28 policy and procedure provided that "[w]hen presented with a controlled substance prescription,

Costco pharmacists must balance providing a high level of member service with ensuring that the 1 prescription is valid and issued for a legitimate medical purpose. Each controlled substance 2 prescription should be evaluated for 'when to fill, when to question, when to delay and when to 3 refuse." The policy and procedure still required the Regional Pharmacy Supervisor's review and 4 approval before the filling of a controlled substance prescription could be denied. In order to 5 deny filling a controlled substance prescription, a pharmacist had to show that there was "clear б evidence or sufficient reason to suspect a forgery or otherwise invalid prescription" except if there 7 was "confirmed evidence of overlapping therapy" or "confirmation of a fraudulent prescription." 8 The policy and procedure further provided that "[w]ith few exceptions (see Controlled Substance ¢, Dispensing Policy) collaboration with your Regional Pharmacy Supervisor is necessary before 10 refusal of your pharmacy service... There must be no doubt that a prescription is fraudulent prior 11 to taking any action or refusing pharmacy services." 12

13 26. From 2000 through May 2013, the Regional Pharmacy Supervisor made the ultimate
14 decision as to whether to dispense a controlled substance prescription. A pharmacist could also
15 not contact law enforcement about a questionable controlled substance prescription without prior
16 approval and knowledge of the Regional Pharmacy Supervisor and Warehouse Management.
17 Pharmacists were disciplined for violating these policies and procedures.

27. As a result of these policies and procedures, Respondents impeded pharmacists from
exercising their professional judgment to fill controlled substance prescriptions and to fulfill their
corresponding responsibility to ensure that controlled substance prescriptions were issued for
legitimate medical purposes. These policies and procedures further allowed for the dispensing,
filling and furnishing of drugs without legitimate medical purposes by Respondents and for a lack
of research or verifying if prescriptions were written for a legitimate medical purpose before
filling them, as discussed in the following paragraphs.

28. From May 15, 2007 through August 25, 2010. Respondents filled and dispensed 156
controlled substances prescriptions written by Dr. L.T. The average age of Dr. L.T.'s patients was
29 years old. The majority of these prescriptions were paid in cash. Patients traveled an average
of 33 miles from Dr. L.T.'s offices to Respondent Costce Pharmacy. Dr. L.T. was not certified as

a pain management provider or affiliated with the American Board of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. There was no stepwise plan for anti-anxiety as Dr. L.T.'s prescriptions were written for an initial therapy that began with high doses of anti-anxiety medications without evidence of prior therapy that would have suggested a stepwise approach.

1

2

3

4

5.

6

7

8

On February 3, 2012, a Second Amended Accusation was filed against Dr. L.T. for 29. among other causes for discipline, gross negligence, repeated negligent acts, issuing controlled substances prescriptions for an illegitimate purpose, making and signing false documents, unprofessional conduct for dispensing, prescribing and furnishing dangerous drugs without an appropriate prior examination and medical indication to patients, excessive prescribing and 9 committing dishonest/corrupt acts. Effective March 14, 2012, the Osteopathic Medical Board of 10 California accepted the surrender of Dr. L.T.'s osteopathic physician and surgeon certificate. 11

30. From February 2, 2006 through July 5, 2006, Respondents filled and dispensed 20 12 prescriptions written by Dr. V.L. The average age of Dr. V.L.'s patients was 24 years old. Dr. 13 V.L.'s prescriptions were written for an excessive quantity of controlled substances (i.e., 14 hydrocodone/APAP 10/325mg with the average number of tablets equaling 180) and unusually 15 high dosages or strength (*i.e.*, 40-50 mg of hydrocodone and 1-1.5 mg of Tylenol per day). 16 17 Patients traveled an average of 17 miles from Dr. V.L.'s offices to Respondent Costco Pharmacy. Dr. V.L. was not certified as a pain management provide or affiliated with the American Board of 18 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 19

On June 15, 2009, in the United States District Court for the Central District of 20 31. California, Dr. V.L. pleaded guilty to 15 counts charging violations of Title 18 U.S.C. § 841 21 (a)(1), intentional and unlawful distribution and dispensing of Schedule II and III controlled 22 substances outside the scope of professional practice. Effective October 1, 2010, the Medical 23 24 Board of California adopted a Decision revoking his license for convictions of crimes that are substantially related to the practice of medicine, violating federal laws regulating dangerous drugs 25 26 or controlled substances and engaging in acts involving dishonesty or corruption.

. 32. From July 27, 2005 through November 19, 2008, Respondents filled and dispensed 47 27 prescriptions written by Dr. C.G. The average age of Dr. C.G.'s patients was 26 years old. 28

Patients traveled an average of 27 miles from Dr. C.G.'s offices to Respondent Costco Pharmacy. Dr. C.G. was not certified as a pain management provider or affiliated with the American Board of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. There was no stepwise plan for anti-anxiety as Dr. C.G.'s prescriptions were written for an initial therapy that began with high doses of anti-anxiety medications without evidence of prior therapy that would have suggested a stepwise approach.

On or about June 11, 2008, Dr. C.G. was convicted upon her plea of nolo contendere 33. in a criminal proceeding filed in Los Angeles County Superior Court to the felonies of unlawfully prescribing controlled substances, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11153(a) and prescribing or administering prescription drugs to an addict or habitual user, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11156. On or about September 12, 2008, a First Amended Accusation was filed against Dr. C.G. for among other causes for discipline, gross negligence, repeated 11 negligent acts, prescribing to an addict, prescribing without appropriate examination, failure to 12 maintain adequate and accurate records and excessive prescribing. Effective March 23, 2009, Dr. 13 C.G.'s physician and surgeon's certificate was placed on probation for seven years by the Medical 14 Board of California. 15

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failing to Comply with Corresponding Responsibility for Legitimate Controlled Substance Prescriptions)

34. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(j), for 19 violating Health and Safety Code section 11153(a), in that they failed to comply with their 20 corresponding responsibility to ensure that controlled substances were dispensed for a legitimate 2.1medical purpose when Respondents furnished prescriptions for controlled substances even though 22"red flags" were present, indicating those prescriptions were not issued for a legitimate medical 23purpose, as set forth in paragraphs 22 through 33 above, which are incorporated herein by 24 reference. 25

27

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

28

8

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 1 (Dispensing Controlled Substance Prescriptions with Significant Errors, Omissions, 2 Irregularities, Uncertainties, Ambiguities or Alterations) 3 35. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for 4 violating title 16, California Code of Regulations, sections 1761(a) and (b) in that they dispensed 5 prescriptions for controlled substances, which contained significant errors, omissions, 6 irregularities, uncertainties, ambiguities or alterations, as set forth in paragraphs 22 through 33 7 above, which are incorporated herein by reference. 8 THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 9 (Unprofessional Conduct) 10 Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301 for 36. 11 unprofessional conduct in that they engaged in the activities described in paragraphs 22 through 12 33 above, which are incorporated herein by reference. 13 DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS 14 37. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Costco 15 Pharmacy, Complainant alleges that on May 17, 2012, the Board issued Citation number CI 2011 16 49350 against Respondent Costco Pharmacy for violating California Code of Regulations, title 17 18 16, section 1764 and Civil Code section 56.10 for the unauthorized disclosure of prescription and medical information. The Board issued a fine which Respondent paid. 19 PRAYER 20 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 21 22 and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision: Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Permit Number PHY 41247 issued to Costco 23 1. Corp., doing business as Costco Pharmacy #454; 24 Revoking or suspending Pharmacist License Number RPH 46609 issued to Laura 25 2. 26 Cody Morris; 27 28 9

Ordering Costco Corp., doing business as Costco Pharmacy #454 and Laura Cody 3. Morris to pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;

4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

3/31/15 DATED:

VĪRGINI

Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant

12 SD2014708110 71024298.doc

Letter of Public Reproval

Exhibit B

Laura Cody Morris 215 Deinenger Circle Corona, CA 92880

Date:

Re: LETTER OF PUBLIC REPROVAL

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Laura Cody Morris, et al., Pharmacist License No, RPH 46609

Dear Ms. Morris:

On April 13, 2015, the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California, filed an Accusation against your Pharmacist License. The Accusation alleged that you engaged in unprofessional conduct as follows:

(1) When you failed to comply with your corresponding responsibility to ensure that controlled substances were dispensed for a legitimate medical purpose in violation of Health & Safety Code section 11153(a).

(2) When you dispensed controlled substance prescriptions with significant errors, omissions, irregularities, uncertainties, ambiguities or alterations in violation of California Code of Regulations, title 16, sections 1761(a) and (b).

(3) When you engaged in the activities set forth above in violation of Business and Professions Code section 4301.

Accordingly, in resolution of this matter under the authority provided under Business and Professions Code section 495, the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs issues this letter of public reproval.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA HEROLD

Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy Department of Consumer Affairs