1	·
1	Kamala D. Harris
2	Attorney General of California JAMES M. LEDAKIS
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General MARICHELLE S. TAHIMIC
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 147392
5	110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266
7	Telephone: (619) 645-3154 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061
8	Attorneys for Complainant
9	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:
12	ROBERT MELGOZA Case No. 3859
13	2101 South Pacific #60 Santa Ana, CA 92704
14	Pharmacy Technician License No. TCH A C C U S A T I O N
15	45260
16	Respondent.
17	Complainant alleges:
18	<u>PARTIES</u>
19	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity
20	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.
21	2. On or about April 7, 2003, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician
22	License Number TCH 45260 to Robert Melgoza (Respondent). The Pharmacy Technician
23	License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will
24	expire on February 28, 2011, unless renewed.
25	<u>JURISDICTION</u>
26	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of
27	Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the
28	Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
ŀ	(

28

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.

9. Section 493 of the Code states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred, but only of that fact, and the board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question.

As used in this section, 'license' includes 'certificate,' 'permit,' 'authority,' and 'registration.'

10. Section 4301 of the Code states:

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:

- (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.
- (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.
- (k) The conviction of more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any dangerous drug or alcoholic beverage, or any combination of those substances.
- (1) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and 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 indictment....

///

28

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(July 27, 2007 Conviction of Receiving Stolen Property, Petty Theft and Possession of Drug Paraphernalia on July 15, 2007)

- 15. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (I) in that he was convicted of crimes that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a pharmacy technician. The circumstances are as follows.
- 16. On or about July 27, 2007, in *The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgoza Camacho aka Robert Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza*, Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 07CM06678, Respondent was convicted by his guilty plea of violation of Penal Code section 496(a), receiving stolen property, and violation of Penal Code section 485, petty theft of lost property, both misdemeanors. Respondent also pled guilty to possession of controlled substance paraphernalia, an opium pipe, which is a violation of Health and Safety Code section 11364, but under Penal Code section 1000, *et seq.*, judgment was deferred for 18 months and Respondent was required to complete a deferred entry of judgment program.
- 17. The circumstances that led to the convictions are that on or about July 15, 2007, Officer C.F. of the Santa Ana Police Department, while on routine patrol, observed a vehicle driving southbound on South Rene Street. The vehicle, driven by Respondent, had darkened front passenger windows, a violation of Vehicle Code section 26708(a)(2). Officer C.F. followed the vehicle and activated his police vehicle's overhead emergency lights to initiate a traffic stop. When Respondent stopped his vehicle, Officer C.F. asked him to lower all of the vehicle's windows. When Officer C.F. looked inside from the rear left passenger window, he observed a glass bulb pipe with burnt residue located on the vehicle's center bench seat directly behind the driver. Officer C.F. recognized the glass pipe to be one commonly used to smoke methamphetamines. Officer C.F. also observed an open container of Bud Light beer in the center console cup holder.
- 18. During the course of the traffic stop, Officer C.F. located the driver's license and social security card belonging to "J.L.M." in Respondent's right front pant pocket. During a

subsequent search of Respondent's vehicle, Officer C.F. found a black, plastic bag inside a speaker box located in the rear storage compartment of Respondent's vehicle. The bag contained numerous documents containing personal identification and account information for people other than Respondent. Respondent explained that his friend, F.G. left the bag and pipe in his vehicle, that he knew the documents containing personal identification and account information did not belong to F.G. and since he did not want F.G. to find the bag, Respondent stated he hid the bag inside the speaker box. Respondent was unable to provide Officer C.F. with F.G.'s contact information. Respondent stated he did not know any of the people identified in the documents and could not explain why he did not attempt to turn the documents in to the police if he believed they were stolen instead of hiding them.

- 19. Respondent was placed under arrest for possession of controlled substance paraphernalia and was transported to the police station. Officer C.F. attempted to contact the people identified in the documents found in the plastic bag in Respondent's possession and was able to speak with P, whose checkbook contained P's contact information. P. told Officer C.F. that several items, including her checkbook and social security card, which was also found in Respondent's possession, had been stolen from her car. P. did not know Respondent or F.G. Officer C.F. was not able to contact the other people identified on the documents found in Respondent's possession.
- 20. As a result of Respondent's conviction of receiving stolen property and petty theft, Respondent was sentenced to 3 years probation, was ordered to pay \$160 in fines and fees, ordered to pay restitution and serve 30 days in jail. On February 18, 2010, deferred entry of judgment on the possession of drug paraphernalia charge was terminated and Respondent was ordered to serve 20 days in jail.

∥ ///

25 | ///

26 | ///

27 ///

28 | ///

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(February 18, 2010 Conviction of Receiving Stolen Property, Burglary and Fraudulently Using an Access Card on December 10, 2008)

- 21. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (l) in that Respondent was convicted of crimes that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a pharmacy technician. The circumstances are as follows.
- 22. On February 18, 2010 in *The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgoza Camacho aka Robert Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza,* Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 09CF0522, Respondent was convicted by his guilty plea of violation of Penal Code section 496(a), receiving stolen property; violation of Penal Code sections 459-460(b), second degree commercial burglary; and, violation of Penal Code section 484g(a), fraudulently using an access card, all felonies.
- 23. The circumstances that led to the conviction are as follows. On December 10, 2008, at approximately 1956 hours, Officers M.K. and R.B. were stopped at the intersection of Main Street and Williams Street in Tustin, during a Special Enforcement Detail patrol of the area. During their patrol, the officers observed a vehicle making a left turn onto Main Street with tinted windows in violation of Vehicle Code 26708.5. The officers also noticed there was no license plate light in violation of Vehicle Code 24601. Officer R.B. activated the emergency lights on the patrol vehicle to initiate a traffic stop. When the vehicle stopped, Respondent was identified as the driver and the passenger was identified as R.C. While speaking with R.C., Officer M.K. observed four large bottles of liquor (Cazadores) in the vehicle. When asked why there were so many bottles of liquor, R.C. explained that they bought the alcohol because his nephew was being baptized and that he bought it nearby. Respondent offered a contradictory explanation for the bottles of liquor. The officers later determined that R.C. was wanted for a parole violation and that Respondent was driving with a suspended license. Both R.C. and Respondent were placed under arrest.
- 24. Officer R.B. conducted a search of Respondent's vehicle and found various credit cards with different names on them, pre-paid Visa and MasterCard credit cards and several credit

card receipts. On the way to the police station, the officers stopped at King Liquor Mart where the clerk told them the bottles of Cazadore had been purchased there by someone who gave him a credit card number verbally and that this person had been in the store before using the same credit card number. Upon further investigation, the surveillance tape at King Liquor Mart earlier that evening showed that Respondent made the purchase.

- 25. While at the police station, Officer M.K. questioned Respondent about a receipt from Ramos Tire Service Center, Inc. Respondent stated that his girlfriend purchased tires at Ramos Tire for his vehicle. Respondent stated he was not present during the purchase and also stated that the tires currently on his vehicle were not the tires purchased because he sold them. It was later discovered that the tires purchased at Ramos Tire Service Center had been purchased with a credit card that was fraudulent and that the credit card company was conducting a fraud investigation. Some of the owners of the credit cards were contacted, who confirmed that their cards had been stolen when their vehicles were burglarized and that unauthorized purchases had been made.
- 26. As a result of Respondent's conviction, he was sentenced to 3 years formal probation, ordered to serve 90 days in jail (served concurrently with Case No. 10HF0193), pay fines and fees of \$320.00, and to have no blank checks in his possession or use or possess credit cards or open credit accounts unless previously approved.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(February 18, 2010 Conviction of Identity Theft and Possession of Controlled Substance Paraphernalia on February 5, 2010)

- 27. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (I) in that Respondent was convicted of crimes that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a pharmacy technician. The circumstances are as follows.
- 28. On or about February 18, 2010 in *The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgoza Camacho aka Robert Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza*, Orange County Superior Court, Harbor Justice Center, Case No. 10HF0193, Respondent was convicted by his guilty plea of violation of Penal Code section 530.5(a), identity

theft, a felony, and violation of Health and Safety Code section 11364, possession of controlled substance paraphernalia, an opium pipe, a misdemeanor.

- 29. The circumstances that led to the conviction are as follows. On February 5, 2010, Officer J.O. of the Costa Mesa Police Department was dispatched to the Marriott Residence Inn. Upon arrival, Officer J.O. spoke with A.B., an employee of the hotel. A.B. told Officer J.O. that about half an hour earlier, she was contacted by an employee of a local pizzeria who asked A.B. if a hotel employee named "Liz" ordered pizza. A.B. advised the pizzeria employee that the hotel did not have any employees named "Liz" and that no hotel employees ordered any food. The pizzeria employee stated that "Liz" purchased a large food order with a suspicious credit card. A.B. stated that the guests in Room 1322 also used a suspicious credit card to pay for their room. According to A.B., the credit card was suspicious because the activation sticker was still affixed to the card and no name was imprinted on the card, just an imprint stating "Temporary Card Only." A.B. and the pizzeria employee determined that the card used for the food order and the guest room was the same card.
- 30. After the conversation with the pizzeria employee, A.B. became more concerned about the credit card used to pay for Room 1322. The name of the person who booked the room was Robert Camacho, one of Respondent's aliases. Officer J.O. obtained Respondent's name and address from the hotel registration and later discovered that there was an outstanding warrant for Respondent, issued by the Central Court on February 2, 2010 for receiving stolen property, burglary, use of a forged credit card and grand theft. The total charges billed to Room 1322 included groceries, telephone calls and other miscellaneous items totaling \$929.99.
- 31. Officer J.O. and other officers went to Room 1322. Respondent was in the room with other subjects. Officer J.O. saw a glass pipe with a bulb on the coffee table in the living room area of the hotel room. The glass pipe had white residue on the bulb and burn marks. Officer J.O. recognized the pipe as one used to smoke methamphetamine. Respondent was placed under arrest. While being searched, a MasterCard credit card with an activation sticker on the front was found in Respondent's pant pocket. The credit card was consistent with the description of the card given by A.B. Respondent stated he met a person in a gas station parking lot who told him

he could get him hotel rooms for half price and that this person, known to Respondent only as "Frank", told him Frank would book the room in Frank's name. Respondent claimed he only used the credit card for incidentals and that he had purchased the credit card at the Check and Go.

- 32. As the search of the room continued, located inside the desk drawer of the main bedroom, the officers found nine temporary bank cards, debit cards, credit cards, gift cards and Respondent's driver's license. One of the credit cards was from Sears and the imprinted name on the card was "H.C.V.", which did not match any of the subjects in the hotel room.
- 33. While at the police station, Officer J.O. confirmed that the Sears credit card found in the hotel room had been reported lost or stolen on February 2, 2010.
- 34. As a result of Respondent's conviction, Respondent was sentenced to 3 years formal probation, ordered to serve 90 days in jail, pay \$600 in fines and fees, have no blank checks in his possession or use or possess credit cards or open credit accounts unless previously approved and ordered not to possess any other person's identifying information or personal financial information unless approved in advance by the Probation Dept.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct - Commission of Acts Involving Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit)

- 35. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (f) for unprofessional conduct in that Respondent committed acts involving dishonesty, fraud and deceit as follows:
- a. On July 15, 2007, Respondent received stolen property and committed petty theft, as more fully set forth in paragraphs 15-20 above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full;
- b. On December 10, 2008, Respondent received stolen property, committed commercial burglary and fraudulently used an access card, as more fully set forth in paragraphs 21-26 above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full; and,
- c. On February 5, 2010, Respondent committed identity theft, as more fully set forth in paragraphs 27-34 above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

27 |

28 | ///

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct - Violation of Laws Regulating Controlled Substances)

- 36. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (j) for unprofessional conduct in that Respondent committed acts in violation of laws regulating controlled substances as follows:
- a. On July 15, 2007, Respondent possessed controlled substance paraphernalia, a misdemeanor in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11364, as more fully set forth in paragraphs 15-20 above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full; and,
- b. On February 5, 2010, Respondent possessed controlled substance paraphernalia, a misdemeanor in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11364, as more fully set forth in paragraphs 27-34 above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(December 20, 2010 Conviction of DUI on October 16, 2010)

- 37. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (l) in that Respondent was convicted of crimes that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a pharmacy technician. The circumstances are as follows.
- 38. On or about December 20, 2010 in *The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgoza Camacho aka Robert Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza*, Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 10CM11243, Respondent was convicted by his guilty plea of violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(a), driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs; and violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(b), driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs with a blood alcohol content of 0.08% or greater, misdemeanors.
- 39. As a result of Respondent's conviction, he was sentenced to 3 years probation and ordered to serve 8 days in jail in lieu of a fine, pay restitution and complete a 3-month First Offender Alcohol Program.

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct – Conviction of More Than One Misdemeanor Involving Controlled Substances or Alcohol)

- 40. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivision (k) for unprofessional conduct in that Respondent was convicted of more than one misdemeanor involving controlled substances as follows:
- a. On July 27, 2007, in *The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgoza*Camacho aka Robert Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza,
 Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 07CM06678, Respondent was
 ordered to complete a deferred entry of judgment program for possession of controlled substance
 paraphernalia, an opium pipe, which is a misdemeanor. On February 18, 2010, deferred entry of
 judgment was terminated and Respondent was convicted of possession of controlled substance
 paraphernalia and ordered to serve 20 days in jail, as more fully set forth in paragraphs 15-20
 above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full; and,
- b. On February 5, 2010, in *The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgoza Camacho aka Robert Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza*, Orange County Superior Court, Harbor Justice Center, Case No. 10HF0193, Respondent was convicted of possession of controlled substance paraphernalia, an opium pipe, which is a misdemeanor, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11364, as more fully set forth in paragraphs 27-34 above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- c. On December 20, 2010, in *The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgoza Camacho aka Robert Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza*, Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 10CM11243, Respondent was convicted by his guilty plea of violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(a), driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs; violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(b), driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs with a blood alcohol content of 0.08% or greater, as more fully set forth in paragraphs 37-39 above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

DISCIPLINE CONSIDERATIONS

- 41. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent. Complainant alleges the following under title 16, California Code of Regulations, section 1769(b)(2):
- a. On July 10, 1998, in The People of the State of California vs. Robert Melgoza Camacho aka Roberto Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza, Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 98CM02335, Respondent was convicted on his guilty plea of violation of Penal Code section 243(b), battery on a peace officer or emergency personnel, and violation of Penal Code section 148(a), resisting a peace officer, misdemeanors.
- **b**. On March 15, 2000, in The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgoza Camacho aka Robert Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza, Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 99CM10391, Respondent was convicted on his guilty plea of violation of Penal Code section 422, making terrorist threats, and violation of Penal Code section 148, resisting or obstructing a peace officer, misdemeanors.
- On March 16, 2001, in The People of the State of California vs. Robert Melguza Camacho aka Robert Melgoza,, Roberto Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza, Orange County Superior Court, Harbor Justice Center, Case No. 01HM01985, Respondent was convicted on his guilty plea of violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(a), driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, a misdemeanor.
- On January 25, 2002, in The People of the State of California vs. Roberto Melgazo d. Camacho aka Robert Melgoza, Roberto Melogoza Camacho, Roberto Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza, Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 02CM00022, Respondent was convicted on his guilty plea of violation of Penal Code section 273.5(a), corporal injury on a spouse/cohabitant, a misdemeanor.
- On April 22, 2002, in The People of the State of California vs. Robert Melgoza Camacho aka Roberto Melgoza Camacho, Roberto Camacho Melgoza, Robert Camacho Melgoza, Orange County Superior Court, Central Justice Center, Case No. 02CM03304,