1	Kamala D. Harris		
2	Attorney General of California LINDA K. SCHNEIDER		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 101336		
4	AMANDA DODDS Senior Legal Analyst		
5	110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101		
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266		
7	Telephone: (619) 645-2141 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061		
8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9	BEFORE THE		
10	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	STATE OF C	CALIFORNIA	
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 4783	
13	NICK KARPACHINSKI	ACCUSATION	
14	1340 Pinnacle Peak Chula Vista, CA 91915		
1			
15	Pharmacist License No. RPH 33217		
16	Pharmacist License No. RPH 33217 Respondent.	•	
16			
16 17			
16 17 18	Respondent. Complainant alleges:	TIES	
16 17 18 19	Respondent. Complainant alleges:	TIES as this Accusation solely in her official capacity	
16 17 18 19 20	Respondent. Complainant alleges:	s this Accusation solely in her official capacity	
16 17 18 19 20 21	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) bring as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharma	s this Accusation solely in her official capacity	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) bring as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharma	es this Accusation solely in her official capacity cy, Department of Consumer Affairs.	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) bring as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharma 2. On or about August 16, 1979, the Bo	gs this Accusation solely in her official capacity cy, Department of Consumer Affairs. pard of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License condent). The Pharmacist License was in full	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) bring as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharma 2. On or about August 16, 1979, the Board Number RPH 33217 to Nick Karpachinski (Respondent).	gs this Accusation solely in her official capacity cy, Department of Consumer Affairs. pard of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License condent). The Pharmacist License was in full	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) bring as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharma 2. On or about August 16, 1979, the Bound Number RPH 33217 to Nick Karpachinski (Respondent and effect at all times relevant to the charge	gs this Accusation solely in her official capacity cy, Department of Consumer Affairs. pard of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License condent). The Pharmacist License was in full	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Complainant alleges: PAR 1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) bring as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharma 2. On or about August 16, 1979, the Bound Number RPH 33217 to Nick Karpachinski (Respondent and effect at all times relevant to the charge 2015, unless renewed.	gs this Accusation solely in her official capacity cy, Department of Consumer Affairs. pard of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License condent). The Pharmacist License was in full	

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
- 4. Section 4300, subdivision (a) of the Code states "Every license issued may be suspended or revoked."
 - 5. Section 4300.1 of the Code states:

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 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 investigation of, or action or disciplinary proceeding against, the licensee or to render a decision suspending or revoking the license.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

6. Section 482 of the Code states:

Each board under the provisions of this code shall develop criteria to evaluate the rehabilitation of a person when:

- (a) Considering the denial of a license by the board under Section 480; or
- (b) Considering suspension or revocation of a license under Section 490.

Each board shall take into account all competent evidence of rehabilitation furnished by the applicant or licensee.

- 7. Section 490 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground 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.
 - 8. 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."

9. 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:

(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.

(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.

/// /// ///

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2	REGULATORY PROVISIONS	
3	10. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1769, states:	
4	••••	
5	(b) When considering the suspension or revocation of a facility or a personal	
6	the board, in evaluating the rehabilitation of such person and his present eligibility for	
7	(1) Nature and severity of the act(s) or offense(s).	
8	(2) Total criminal record.	
9	(3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s).	
10 11	(4) Whether the licensee has complied with all terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the licensee.	
12	(5) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the licensee.	
13	11. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, states:	
4	For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a personal or facility	
5	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	
16 17		
18	COSTS	
19	12. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the	
20	administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of	
21	the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and	
22	enforcement of the case, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being	
23	renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be	
24	included in a stipulated settlement.	
25		
26		
27	///	
28		
	4	

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(July 30, 2012 Criminal Conviction for DUI on May 8, 2012)

- 13. Respondent has subjected his license to discipline under sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (I) of the Code in that he was convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, duties, and functions of a pharmacist. The circumstances are as follows:
- a. On or about July 30, 2012, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People of the State of California v. Nick Karpachinski*, in San Diego County Superior Court, case number S257814, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b), driving with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of .08 percent or higher, a misdemeanor. Respondent admitted and the court found true the special allegation that his BAC was .15 percent or more, within the meaning of Vehicle Code section 23578. Pursuant to the plea agreement, the court dismissed an additional count of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a), driving under the influence of alcohol/drugs.
- b. As a result of the conviction, on or about July 30, 2012, Respondent was granted five years summary probation, and ordered to complete 10 days in the Public Service Program, with credit for one day, complete a three-month First Conviction Program and a MADD Victim Impact Panel, pay fees, fines and restitution, and comply with DUI probation terms. The court certified Respondent's BAC as .22 percent.
- c. The facts that led to the conviction are that on or about the afternoon of May 8, 2012, a patrol officer with the Chula Vista Police Department was dispatched to a report of a non-injury collision involving Respondent and another driver. Upon arrival, the officer motioned for Respondent to come to the officer's location; Respondent staggered across the road. The officer observed that Respondent's speech was slurred, he seemed confused, and there was a strong odor of an alcoholic beverage on his breath. The officer had Respondent sit on the curb to avoid falling down and injuring himself. Respondent admitted that he had consumed beer prior to driving, and various prescription medications within the previous 24 hours. Respondent was unable to safely perform the field sobriety tests, so they were discontinued by the officer. Respondent was arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 14. caused a collision, as detailed in paragraph 13, above. PRAYER

(Dangerous Use of Alcohol)

Respondent has subjected his registration to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (h) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that on or about May 8, 2012, Respondent used alcoholic beverages to the extent or in a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to himself, and to others, in that he operated a motor vehicle while significantly impaired and

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

- 1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacist License Number RPH 33217, issued to Nick Karpachinski;
- 2. Ordering Nick Karpachinski 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;
 - 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

9/6/13 Executive/Officer

Board of Pharmacy

Department of Consumer Affairs State of California

Complainant

SD2013705532

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28