

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

In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:

MARTIN ARNULF MEDINA,

Pharmacy Technician Registration Applicant,

Respondent.

Case No. 5416

OAH No. 2015100136

DECISION

The attached Proposed Decision of the Administrative Law Judge is hereby adopted by the Board of Pharmacy as the decision in the above-entitled matter, except that, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code section 11517, subdivision (c)(2)(C), the following technical change is made to page two, paragraph #3:

“On July 21, 2015, Complainant filed a Statement of Issues in this matter in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board. This hearing ensued.”

The technical change made above does not affect the factual or legal basis of the Proposed Decision, which shall become effective on February 24, 2016.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 25th day of January, 2016.

BOARD OF PHARMACY
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA



By

Amy Gutierrez, Pharm.D.
Board President

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

In the Matter of the Statement of Issues
Against:

MARTIN ARNULF MEDINA,

Pharmacy Technician Registration Applicant

Respondent.

Case No. 5416

OAH No. 2015100136

PROPOSED DECISION

This matter came on regularly for hearing on December 2, 2015, before Carla L. Garrett, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, in Los Angeles, California.

M. Travis Peery, Deputy Attorney General, represented Complainant Virginia Herold, Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs (Complainant). Respondent, Martin Arnulf Medina (Respondent), appeared at the hearing and represented himself.

At hearing, Complainant amended the Statement of Issues to make two corrections. Specifically, on page 5, line 14, the language should read, "Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b)," not "subdivision (d)." Additionally, line 21 should read "26 alcohol," not "16 alcohol."

Oral and documentary evidence was received, the record was closed, and the matter was submitted for decision on December 2, 2015.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Respondent filed an application for registration as a pharmacy technician with the Board on February 28, 2014, which included Respondent's certification, under penalty of perjury, of the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and representations contained within. On December 19, 2014, the Board denied Respondent's application based on Respondent's conviction of a substantially related crime, knowingly making a false statement of fact to the Board, and engaging in acts warranting denial of licensure, as described in more detail below.

2. On February 17, 2015, Respondent filed an appeal of the Board's denial of his application.

3. On October 15, 2015, Complainant filed a Statement of Issues in this matter in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board. This hearing ensued.

4. On January 6, 2014, in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, in Case No. 3JB08706, pursuant to a plea of nolo contendere, Respondent suffered a conviction for driving while having a .08% or more, by weight, blood alcohol content (BAC), in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b), a misdemeanor substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a pharmacy technician pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770.

5. The facts and circumstances underlying the conviction occurred on October 27, 2013. Respondent was at his house consuming three or four tall cans of beer with a friend. Respondent told his friend that he needed to pick up his girlfriend from work. His friend volunteered to drive. After driving a short time, Respondent concluded his friend was drunk. Consequently, Respondent asked his friend to pull over so Respondent could drive, even though Respondent had no driver's license. Respondent believed he was less intoxicated than his friend, and could drive the remainder of the short trip with less difficulty than his friend. His friend complied. As Respondent drove, an officer patrolling the area observed Respondent's car straddling the lane while he held a cell phone to his ear. As a result, the officer conducted a traffic stop. Upon contact, the officer smelled the odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from Respondent's breath and person, and saw he had red, watery, bloodshot eyes. When Respondent spoke to the officer, he admitted he had no driver's license. The officer noticed Respondent slurred his speech. As a result, the officer required Respondent to submit to a field sobriety test, which he did, and concluded Respondent was under the influence of alcohol. The officer then requested Respondent to submit to a breathalyzer test, which he did. The results of the test showed Respondent had a blood alcohol content of .189. The officer arrested Respondent. When Respondent arrived at the police station, the officer administered additional breath tests, which yielded results of .22 and .23 blood alcohol content.

6. The Court placed Respondent on 36 months of probation with terms and conditions, including the payment of costs, fees, and assessments. In addition, the Court ordered Respondent to complete a six-month First Offender Alcohol and Other Drug Education and Counseling Program, to attend a Victim Program of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, to complete 26 Alcohol and Narcotics Anonymous meetings, and ordered him to pay a fine or complete 12 days of tree farm service. Respondent has completed all conditions of his probation, with the exception of his payment of fines, which he is paying on a monthly basis. Respondent's probation is scheduled to terminate on January 6, 2017.

7. Respondent submitted an application on February 28, 2014, which he signed on January 30, 2014, certifying, under penalty of perjury, the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and representations contained within. Question No. 7 on the application asked,

“Have you ever been convicted of any crime in any state, the USA and its territories, military court or foreign country?” Respondent responded to that question in the negative, even though he had been convicted a few weeks prior on January 6, 2014. At hearing, Respondent explained that he responded to Question No. 7 in the negative, because he learned from friends that their licenses had been revoked as a result of a criminal conviction. Respondent wanted at least to have an opportunity to have a license, so he lied hoping the Board would allow him to have a license despite of his conviction.

Mitigating and Aggravating Circumstances

8. From March 2014 to January 2015, Respondent worked at a pharmacy carrying out duties similar to a pharmacy technician, such as processing prescriptions. The pharmacy was aware Respondent did not have his pharmacy technician registration. The pharmacy was also aware of Respondent’s arrest and subsequent conviction. However, after the pharmacy underwent an audit generated by the State of California, Respondent was fired because he had not been licensed by the State of California to act as a pharmacy technician. Currently, Respondent works full-time in a warehouse.

9. Since his arrest and conviction, Respondent has refrained from driving, because he still has not procured a driver’s license. Additionally, Respondent does not get into vehicles with individuals who have been consuming alcohol. When Respondent consumes alcoholic beverages, he does so at home or at a friend’s house.

10. Respondent lives with his grandparents, and surrounds himself with people who are positive influences. Respondent’s friends, who are full-time students, have been encouraging Respondent to attend college. In that regard, Respondent has taken a placement test at a community college and hopes to begin attending classes next semester.

11. In his testimony, Respondent demonstrated contrition and remorse for his past actions. Respondent would like to obtain his pharmacy technician registration so he can support himself.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Business and Professions Code¹ section 4300 authorizes the Board to refuse an applicant’s application for registration as a pharmacy technician. After refusal of the application, the burden of proof is on the license applicant to show that he or she is qualified to hold the license. To prevail in this matter, Respondent must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that he is entitled to a pharmacy technician registration. (Evid. Code, §§ 115, 500.)

¹ All further statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

2. Section 480, subdivision (a), addresses the Board's authority to deny a license application. It states:

~~(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. 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, 1203.4a, or 1203.41 of the Penal Code.

(2) Done any act involving dishonesty, fraud, or deceit with the intent to substantially benefit himself or herself or another, or substantially injure another.

(3)(A) Done any act that if done by a licentiate of the business or profession in question, would be grounds for suspension or revocation of license.

(B) 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 business or profession for which application is made.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this code, a person shall not be denied a license solely on the basis that he or she has been convicted of a felony if he or she has obtained a certificate of rehabilitation under Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 4852.01) of Title 6 of Part 3 of the Penal Code or that he or she has been convicted of a misdemeanor if he or she has met all applicable requirements of the criteria of rehabilitation developed by the board to evaluate the rehabilitation of a person when considering the denial of a license under subdivision (a) of Section 482.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this code, a person shall not be denied a license solely on the basis of a conviction that has been dismissed pursuant to Section 1203.4, 1203.4a, or 1203.41 of the Penal Code. An applicant who has a conviction that has been dismissed pursuant to Section 1203.4, 1203.4a, or 1203.41 of the Penal Code shall provide proof of the dismissal.

(d) A board may deny a license regulated by this code on the ground that the applicant knowingly made a false statement of fact that is required to be revealed in the application for the license.

3. Section 490 provides, in pertinent part, that a board may suspend or revoke a license on the grounds 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.

4. Section 4300 provides, in pertinent part, that every license issued by the Board is subject to discipline, including suspension or revocation.

5. 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:

[¶] . . . [¶]

(l) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. . . . 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 a 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.

[¶] . . . [¶]

(o) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of or conspiring to violate any provisions 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.

(p) Actions or conduct that would have warranted denial of a license.

6. 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.

Here, Respondent's conviction is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a pharmacy technician, as it is related to alcohol abuse. Reference is made to *In re Griffiths* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 757, where a physician had two convictions for reckless driving involving alcohol and a conviction for driving under the influence within a three-year period. Of significance to the court, a physician would have increased knowledge of the detrimental effects of alcohol consumption and the increased risks that result, and the repeated convictions and actions reflected poorly on Griffiths' common sense and professional judgment. Similarly, Respondent, as one who received pharmacy technician training, showed a lack of judgment when he elected to drive after consuming alcohol.

7. Cause exists to deny Respondent's application for registration under section 480, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent was convicted of a substantially related crime, as set forth in Factual Findings 4 through 6.

8. Cause exists to deny Respondent's application for registration under section 480, subdivision (c), in that Respondent knowingly made a false statement of fact on his application, as set forth in Factual Finding 7.

9. Cause exists to deny Respondent's application under sections 480, subdivision (a)(3), and 4301, subdivisions (o) and (p), in that Respondent did an act which, if done by a Board licensee, would constitute cause for discipline. Specifically, Respondent suffered a conviction, as set forth in Factual Findings 4 through 6, and knowingly made a false statement of fact by failing to disclose his January 6, 2014 conviction, as set forth in Factual Finding 7.

10. The Board enacted a regulation • California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1769 • which sets forth certain criteria that should be considered in evaluating the rehabilitation of an applicant and his or her present eligibility for registration. These criteria include: (1) The nature and severity of the acts or offenses under consideration; (2) evidence of any acts committed subsequent to the acts or crimes under consideration; (3) the time that has elapsed since commission of such acts or crimes; (4) whether the applicant complied with any terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the applicant; and (5) evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the applicant.

11. Applying the rehabilitation criteria, Respondent has not demonstrated rehabilitation. Specifically, Respondent's conviction occurred just last year in 2014 for an act he committed on October 27, 2013, and he currently remains on probation.

Consequently, insufficient time has elapsed since he committed his crime and suffered a conviction. Of greater concern is Respondent's decision to knowingly make a false statement to the Board (i.e., a misrepresentation on his application). Such action not only evidences Respondent's lack of rehabilitation, but it establishes that Respondent is a potential threat to the public, because he lacks integrity. As such, Respondent's application shall be denied.

ORDER

The application of Respondent Martin Arnulf Medina for a registration to act as a Pharmacy Technician is denied.

DATED: December 17, 2015

DocuSigned by:
Carla Garrett
40D88C3B895043D...

CARLA L. GARRETT
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
2 LINDA K. SCHNEIDER
Senior Assistant Attorney General
3 THOMAS L. RINALDI
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 206911
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
5 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 897-2541
6 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804
Attorneys for Complainant
7

8 **BEFORE THE**
9 **BOARD OF PHARMACY**
10 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
11 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 In the Matter of the Statement of Issues
12 Against:

Case No. 5416

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

13 **MARTIN ARNULF MEDINA**

14 Pharmacy Technician Registration Applicant

15 Respondent.

16 Complainant alleges:

17 **PARTIES**

18 1. 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 (Board).

21 2. On or about February 28, 2014, the Board received an application for a Pharmacy
22 Technician Registration from Martin Arnulf Medina aka Martin Arnolo Medina aka Martin
23 Arnold Medina (Respondent). On or about January 30, 2014, Respondent certified under penalty
24 of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and representations in the application.
25 The Board denied the application on December 19, 2014.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **JURISDICTION**

2 3. This Statement of Issues is brought before the Board under the authority of the
3 following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless
4 otherwise indicated.

5 **STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

6 4. Section 480 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

7 “(a) A board may deny a license regulated by this code on the grounds that the applicant
8 has one of the following:

9 “(1) Been convicted of a crime. A conviction within the meaning of this section means a
10 plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action that a
11 board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken when the
12 time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when
13 an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a
14 subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4, 1203.4a, or 1203.41 of the Penal Code.

15 “(2) Done any act involving dishonesty, fraud, or deceit with the intent to substantially
16 benefit himself or herself or another, or substantially injure another.

17 “(3) (A) Done any act that if done by a licentiate of the business or profession in question,
18 would be grounds for suspension or revocation of license.

19 (B) The board may deny a license pursuant to this subdivision only if the crime or
20 act is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession
21 for which application is made.

22 “(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this code, a person shall not be denied a
23 license solely on the basis that he or she has been convicted of a felony if he or she has obtained a
24 certificate of rehabilitation under Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 4852.01) of Title 6 of
25 Part 3 of the Penal Code or that he or she has been convicted of a misdemeanor if he or she has
26 met all applicable requirements of the criteria of rehabilitation developed by the board to evaluate
27 the rehabilitation of a person when considering the denial of a license under subdivision (a) of
28 Section 482.

1 "(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this code, a person shall not be denied a
2 license solely on the basis of a conviction that has been dismissed pursuant to Section 1203.4,
3 1203.4a, or 1203.41 of the Penal Code. An applicant who has a conviction that has been
4 dismissed pursuant to Section 1203.4, 1203.4a, or 1203.41 of the Penal Code shall provide proof
5 of the dismissal.

6 "(d) A board may deny a license regulated by this code on the ground that the applicant
7 knowingly made a false statement of fact required to be revealed in the application for the
8 license."

9 5. Section 490 of the Code provides that a board may suspend or revoke a license on the
10 ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications,
11 functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.

12 6. Section 4300 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

13

14 "(c) The board may refuse a license to any applicant guilty of unprofessional conduct.
15 The board may, in its sole discretion, issue a probationary license to any applicant for a license
16 who is guilty of unprofessional conduct and who has met all other requirements for licensure.
17 The board may issue the license subject to any terms or conditions not contrary to public policy.
18 .."

19 7. Section 4301 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

20 "The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty of unprofessional
21 conduct or whose license has been procured by fraud or misrepresentation or issued by mistake.
22 Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

23

24 "(f) The commission of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or
25 corruption, whether the act is committed in the course of relations as a licensee or otherwise, and
26 whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not.

27

28 "(h) The administering to oneself, of any controlled substance, or the use of any dangerous

1 drug or of alcoholic beverages to the extent or in a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to
2 oneself, to a person holding a license under this chapter, or to any other person or to the public, or
3 to the extent that the use impairs the ability of the person to conduct with safety to the public the
4 practice authorized by the license.

5

6 "(l) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and
7 duties of a licensee under this chapter. The record of conviction of a violation of Chapter 13
8 (commencing with Section 801) of Title 21 of the United States Code regulating controlled
9 substances or of a violation of the statutes of this state regulating controlled substances or
10 dangerous drugs shall be conclusive evidence of unprofessional conduct. In all other cases, the
11 record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred.
12 The board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, in order
13 to fix the degree of discipline or, in the case of a conviction not involving controlled substances
14 or dangerous drugs, to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the
15 qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. A plea or verdict of guilty or
16 a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning
17 of this provision. The board may take action when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the
18 judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made
19 suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of
20 the Penal Code allowing the person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not
21 guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or
22 indictment.

23

24 "(o) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the
25 violation of or conspiring to violate any provision or term of this chapter or of the applicable
26 federal and state laws and regulations governing pharmacy, including regulations established by
27 the board or by any other state or federal regulatory agency.

28 "(p) Actions or conduct that would have warranted denial of a license. . . ."

1 **REGULATORY PROVISION**

2 8. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, states:

3 "For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a personal or facility license
4 pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Business and Professions Code, a
5 crime or act shall be considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a
6 licensee or registrant if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a
7 licensee or registrant to perform the functions authorized by his license or registration in a
8 manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare."

9 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION**

10 **(Conviction of a Substantially Related Crime)**

11 9. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 480, subdivision (a)(1), in
12 that Respondent was convicted of a substantially related crime, as follows:

13 a. On or about January 6, 2014, after pleading nolo contendere, Respondent was
14 convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (d)
15 [driving while having 0.08% or more, by weight, blood alcohol content (BAC), in the criminal
16 proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California v. Martin Arnold Medina* (Super. Ct.
17 L.A. County, 2014, No. 3JB08706). Respondent admitted the special allegation pursuant to
18 Vehicle Code section 23578 [excessive BAC of 0.15% or more, by weight]. The Court placed
19 Respondent on 36 months probation, ordered him to complete a six-month First-Offender
20 Alcohol and Other Drug Education and Counseling Program, ordered him to attend a Victim
21 Impact Program of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, ordered him to complete 16 alcohol and
22 narcotics anonymous meetings, and ordered him to pay a fine or complete 12 days of tree farm
23 service.

24 b. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about October 27, 2013,
25 a Covina Police Department officer made a traffic stop on Respondent. The officer contacted
26 Respondent who displayed symptoms consistent with alcohol intoxication. Respondent took, but
27 could not complete field sobriety tests. A subsequent breath test revealed a BAC of 0.22% and
28 0.23%.

1 **SECOND CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION**

2 **(Knowingly Made a False Statement of Fact)**

3 10. Respondent's application is subject to denial under section 480, subdivision (c), in
4 that on or about January 30, 2014, Respondent knowingly made a false statement of fact by
5 failing to disclose his January 6, 2014 conviction on his application for licensure to the Board as
6 required. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth in
7 paragraph 9, as though set forth fully.

8 **THIRD CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION**

9 **(Acts Warranting Denial of Licensure)**

10 11. Respondent's application is subject to denial under sections 4301, subdivision (o) and
11 / or (p), and 480, subdivisions (a)(3), on the grounds of unprofessional conduct, in that
12 Respondent committed acts which if done by a licentiate of the business and profession in
13 question, would be grounds for suspension or revocation of his license, as follows:

14 a. On or about January 6, 2014, Respondent was convicted of a crime substantially
15 related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a pharmacy technician which to a substantial
16 degree evidence his present or potential unfitness to perform the functions authorized by his
17 license in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare, in violation of sections
18 490 and 4301, subdivision (l), and in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16,
19 section 1770. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth
20 above in paragraph 9, as though set forth fully.

21 b. On or about January 30, 2014, Respondent committed acts involving moral turpitude,
22 dishonesty, fraud, deceit or corruption by knowingly making a false statement of fact by failing to
23 disclose his January 6, 2014 conviction on his application, in violation of section 4301,
24 subdivision (f). Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth
25 above in paragraphs 10, as though set forth fully.

26 c. On or about April 16, 2011, Respondent used alcoholic beverages to an extent or in a
27 manner dangerous or injurious to herself, any person, or the public, in violation of section 4301,
28 subdivision (h). Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set

1 forth above in paragraph 9, subparagraph b, inclusive, as though set forth fully.

2 **PRAYER**

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

- 5 1. Denying the application of Respondent for a Pharmacy Technician Registration;
- 6 2. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

7
8 DATED: 7/21/15 Virginia Herold

9 VIRGINIA HEROLD
10 Executive Officer
11 Board of Pharmacy
12 Department of Consumer Affairs
13 State of California
14 Complainant

15 LA2015500404
16 51782530_2.doc

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28