ı	1	·
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California LINDA K. SCHNEIDER Senior Assistant Attorney General JAMES M. LEDAKIS Supervising Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 132645 110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101 P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 645-2105 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant  BEFORE THI BOARD OF PHARI DEPARTMENT OF CONSIL	MACY
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11		G N. 5210
13	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 5319
14	YVETTE K. KONSTANTINOVA 5664 Arbor Grove Court San Diego, CA 92121	ACCUSATION
15	Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 66537	·
16	Respondent.	
17		
18	Complainant alleges:	
19	PARTIES	
20	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official	
21	capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.	
22	2. On December 15, 2005, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician	
23	Registration Number TCH 66537 to Yvette K. Konstantinova (Respondent). Respondent has also	
24	been known as Yvette Kirilova Konstantinova. The Pharmacy Technician Registration was in	
25	full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on	
26	February 28, 2015, unless renewed.	
27	<i>!!!</i>	
28	·///	
	1	

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 unless otherwise indicated.

4. Section 4300, subdivision (a), of the Code provides that every license issued by the Board 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 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.

(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.

## REGULATORY PROVISIONS

- 8. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1769, states:
- (b) When considering the suspension or revocation of a facility or a personal license on the ground that the licensee or the registrant has been convicted of a crime, the board, in evaluating the rehabilitation of such person and his present eligibility for a license will consider the following criteria:
  - (1) Nature and severity of the act(s) or offense(s).
  - (2) Total criminal record.
- (3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s).
- (4) Whether the licensee has complied with all terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the licensee.
  - (5) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the licensee.

9. 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.

#### COST RECOVERY

10. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be included in a stipulated settlement.

## FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (August 11, 2014 Conviction for Driving with a BAC .08 Percent or More on June 2, 2014)

- 11. Respondent has subjected her pharmacy technician registration to discipline under Code sections 490 and 4301, subdivision (l), in that she was convicted of crimes that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a registered pharmacy technician. The circumstances are as follows:
- a. On August 11, 2014, in a criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California v. Yvette Kirilova Konstantinova*, in the San Diego County Superior Court, Central Courthouse, Criminal Division Case Number M186503, Respondent was convicted on her plea of no contest to violating Vehicle Code (VC) sections 23152, subdivisions (a), driving while under the influence of alcohol (DUI), and (b), driving with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.08 percent or more, misdemeanors. Respondent admitted and the court found true the allegation that pursuant to VC sections 23626 and 23540, within ten years of violating VC section 23152, subdivisions (a) and (b), mentioned above, on February 16, 2008, Respondent committed a separate violation of VC section 23152, subdivision (b), driving with a BAC of 0.08

percent or more, a misdemeanor resulting in a conviction on April 3, 2008, in case number M044374, detailed in paragraph 15, below.

- b. As a result of the convictions, on August 11, 2014, Respondent was sentenced to be committed to the custody of the San Diego County Sheriff for 96 hours, to be served under the work release program. Respondent was granted five years summary probation under standard alcohol conditions. Respondent was ordered to pay fines and restitution and render 20 days of work under the public service program, with credit for two days served. Respondent was also ordered to attend and satisfactorily complete a multiple offender DUI program and a Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) Victim Impact Panel session. Respondent was further ordered to install an ignition interlock device in her vehicle for two years.
- c. The facts that led to the conviction are that on June 2, 2014, Respondent was reported as a possible drunk driver while she was driving in the Carmel Mountain Road and Paseo Cardiel area in San Diego, California. Respondent continued driving to her residence where responding officers from the San Diego Police Department (SDPD) followed. One police officer walked up to Respondent and smelled alcohol from Respondent's person and from her breath as she talked. Respondent's eyes were glassy and she was unable to stand without swaying. Respondent's clothes were disheveled and her speech was slurred and difficult to understand. Respondent failed the series of field sobriety tests, which she could not complete. Respondent could not complete a preliminary alcohol sensor test either. Respondent was arrested and transported to the SDPD headquarters, where she consented to chemical breath tests. Respondent's subsequent chemical test results indicated a BAC of .24 percent and .23 percent after three minutes.

# SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Unprofessional Conduct - Dangerous Use of Alcohol)

12. Respondent has subjected her pharmacy technician registration to discipline under Code section 4301, subdivision (h) in that on June 2, 2014, she used alcohol to the extent and in

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

2021

22

2324

2526

27

28

a manner that was dangerous and injurious to herself and to the public, as described in the cause above, which is incorporated by reference.

## THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Conviction of Alcohol Related Misdemeanors)

13. Respondent has subjected her pharmacy technician registration to discipline under Code section 4301, subdivision (k) in that on August 11, 2014, she was convicted of more than one misdemeanor involving the use or consumption of alcohol.

### DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

- 14. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, Complainant alleges:
- On April 3, 2008, in a prior criminal proceeding entitled The People of the State 15. of California v. Yvette Kirilova Konstantinova, in the San Diego County Superior Court, Central Courthouse, Criminal Division Case Number M044374, Respondent was convicted on her plea of no contest to violating VC section 23152, subdivision (b), driving with a BAC of 0.08 percent or more, a misdemeanor. A misdemeanor charge for violation of VC section 23152, subdivision (a), DUI, was dismissed pursuant to a plea bargain. As a result of the conviction, on April 3, 2008, Respondent was sentenced to five years summary probation under standard alcohol conditions and ordered to attend and satisfactorily complete a first offender DUI program for nine months and a MADD Victim Impact Panel session. Respondent was also ordered to pay fines, fees, restitution, and penalty assessments and render 15 days work under the public service program, with credit for two days served. The facts that led to the conviction are that on February 16, 2008, while driving on Stalmer Street in San Diego, California, Respondent's car crashed into a legally parked vehicle. Respondent stayed by her car until responding officers from the SDPD arrived. A police officer initiated contact with Respondent and smelled alcohol from Respondent's person and from her breath. Respondent's face was lax and she swayed while standing. Respondent failed the series of field sobriety tests, which she could not complete. Respondent was arrested and transported to the SDPD headquarters, where she consented to provide a blood sample, which upon testing indicated a BAC of .32 percent.