1			
2			
3			
4	·		
5			
6			
7	BEFORE THE		
8	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10	In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Case No. 5342		
11	Against: RACHEL MICHELE CONOVER		
12	aka RACHEL GUZMAN aka RACHEL SHEPARD WITHDRAWAL OF STATEMENT OF		
13	Applicant for Pharmacist License		
14	Respondent.		
15			
16	The Statement of Issues No. 5342 against Rachel Michelle Conover (Respondent) is		
17	withdrawn without prejudice. Respondent has withdrawn the request for a hearing regarding the		
18	denial of the application for a pharmacist licensure and examination. The denial of the		
19	application is affirmed.		
20			
21	Virginia Herold		
22	Virginia Herold		
23	DATED: 5/18/2015 VIRGINIA HEROLD		
24	Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy		
25	Department of Consumer Affairs State of California		
26	Complainant		
27			
28			
	.1		

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California FRANK H. PACOE Supervising Deputy Attorney General JOSHUA A. ROOM Supervising Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 214663 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 703-1299 Facsimile: (415) 703-5480 Attorneys for Complainant BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
10	In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:	Case No. 5342		
11	RACHEL MICHELLE CONOVER			
12	aka RACHEL GUZMAN aka RACHEL SHEPARD	STATEMENT OF ISSUES		
13	Applicant for Pharmacist License			
14 15	Respondent.			
16	Complainant alleges:			
17	PARTIES PARTIES			
18	Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Statement of Issues solely in her official			
19	capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.			
20	2. On or about April 16, 2014, the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs			
21	received a (Retake) Application for Pharmacist Licensure and Examination from Rachel Michelle			
22	Conover aka Rachel Guzman aka Rachel Shepard (Respondent). On or about April 14, 2014,			
23	Respondent certified under penalty of perjury the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and			
24	representations in the application. The Board denied the application on September 19, 2014.			
25	<u>JURISDICTION</u>			
26	3. This Statement of Issues is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board),			
27	Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section			
28	references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.			
	1			

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS

- 4. Section 4300, subdivision (c), of the Code states in pertinent part:
- "(c) The board may refuse a license to any applicant guilty of unprofessional conduct. The board may, in its sole discretion, issue a probationary license to any applicant for a license who is guilty of unprofessional conduct and who has met all other requirements for licensure. The board may issue the license subject to any terms or conditions not contrary to public policy"
- 5. Section 4301 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that "unprofessional conduct" is defined to include, but not be limited to, any of the following:
- (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.
- (I) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter.
 - 6. Section 480 of the Code states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) A board may deny a license regulated by this code on the grounds that the applicant has one of the following:
- "(1) Been convicted of a crime.... Any action which a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken... irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code.
- "(2) Done any act involving dishonesty, fraud or deceit with the intent to substantially benefit himself or another, or substantially injure another; or
- "(3) Done any act which if done by a licentiate of the business or profession in question, would be grounds for suspension or revocation of license.
- "The board may deny a license pursuant to this subdivision only if the crime or act is substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of the . . . [license]."

///

 7. 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."

FIRST CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Conviction of Substantially Related Crime(s))

- 8. Respondent's application is subject to denial under the following section(s) of the Code: 480(a)(1); 480(a)(3) by reference to 4301(l); and/or 4300(c) by reference to 4301(l) and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, for conviction of a substantially related crime, in that on or about April 15, 2014, in the criminal case *People v. Rachel Michelle Conover*, Case No. C1478097 in Santa Clara County Superior Court, Respondent was convicted of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) (Driving With Blood Alcohol of 0.08% or More), a misdemeanor. The conviction was entered as follows:
- a. On or about October 1, 2013, a car driven by Respondent was involved in a multi-vehicle accident in San Jose, California. Responding officer(s) from the San Jose Police Department detected the odor of alcohol on Respondent, and she admitted to consuming alcohol. A blood sample taken from Respondent subsequently reported a blood alcohol value of 0.15%. Respondent was placed under arrest for driving under the influence, and causing injury.
- b. On or about March 6, 2014, in *People v. Rachel Michelle Conover*, Case No. C1478097 in Santa Clara County Superior Court, Respondent was charged with violating (1) Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a) (Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol), a misdemeanor, and (2) Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) (Driving With Blood Alcohol Level of 0.08% or Higher), a misdemeanor, with special allegations under each count of having a blood alcohol level of 0.15% or more within the meaning of Vehicle Code section 23578.

///