1	Kamala D. Harris		
2	Attorney General of California GREGORY J. SALUTE	·	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 164015		
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		
11	STATE OF C	CALIFORNIA	
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 5367	
13	MARK KIM PHAM	ACCUSATION	
14	2302 West Avalon Avenue Santa Ana, CA 92706		
15	Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 74216		
16	Respondent.		
17			
18			
19	Complainant alleges:		
20	PARTIES		
21	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity		
22	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.		
23	2. On or about February 9, 2007, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician		
24	Registration Number TCH 74216 to Mark Kim Pham (Respondent). The Pharmacy Technician		
25	Registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and		
26	will expire on September 30, 2016, unless renewed.		
27			
28			
28	111	1Accusation	

1	JURISDICTION		
2	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of		
3	Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the		
4	Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.		
5	4. Section 4300(a) of the Code states "Every license issued may be suspended or		
6	revoked."		
7	5. Section 4300.1 of the Code states:		
8	The expiration, cancellation, forfeiture, or suspension of a board-issued license by		
9	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		
10	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.		
11			
12	STATUTORY PROVISIONS		
13	6. Section 482 of the Code states:		
14	Each board under the provisions of this code shall develop criteria to evaluate the rehabilitation of a person when:		
15	(a) Considering the denial of a license by the board under Section 480; or		
16	(b) Considering suspension or revocation of a license under Section 490.		
17 18	Each board shall take into account all competent evidence of rehabilitation furnished by the applicant or licensee.		
19	7. Section 490 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that a board may suspend or		
20	revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially		
21	related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the		
22	license was issued.		
23	8. Section 493 of the Code states:		
24	Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in a proceeding conducted by a board		
25	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		
26			
27	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		
28	circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime in order to fix the degree of		
	2		
l	Accusation		

100

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:

(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.

(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

. . . .

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

26

27

28

10. 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).

1	(2) Total criminal record.	
2	(3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s).	
3	(4) Whether the licensee has complied with all terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the licensee.	
4 5	(5) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the licensee.	
6	11. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, states:	
7 8 9 10	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.	
11	COSTS	
12	12. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the	
13	administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of	
14	the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and	
15	enforcement of the case, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not	
16	being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs	
17	may be included in a stipulated settlement.	
18	FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
19	(October 20, 2014 Criminal Conviction for Making Annoying Telephone Calls)	
20	13. Respondent has subjected his registration to discipline under sections 490 and 4301(l)	
21	of the Code in that he was convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications,	
22	duties, and functions of a pharmacy technician. The circumstances are as follows:	
23	a. On or about October 20, 2014, in a criminal proceeding entitled <i>People of the</i>	
24	State of California v. Mark Kim Pham, in Riverside County Superior Court, case number	
25	RIF1401028, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to violating Penal Code section	
26	653m(b), making annoying telephone calls, a misdemeanor. Pursuant to a plea agreement, the	
27	court dismissed additional felony counts of using personal identification of another to obtain	
28	credit (Pen. Code, § 530.5(a)), and unauthorized use of computer data (Pen. Code, § 502(c)(2));	
	4	

as well as misdemeanor counts of accessing a computer network without permission (Pen. Code, § 502(c)(7)), and impersonating another person through the internet (Pen. Code, § 528.5(a)).

1

2

b. As a result of the conviction, Respondent was granted summary probation for 3 36 months, and ordered to serve 120 days in the custody of the Riverside County Sheriff's 4 Electronic Monitoring Program, pay fees, fines, and restitution, and not have any direct or 5 indirect contact with the victim. Respondent was required to submit to a Fourth Amendment 6 waiver for the search and/or seizure of all computers, memory storage devices, electronic mail, or 7 log files and data stored electronically on any media. He was further ordered not conceal the 8 source, destination or content of any electronic communication, to provide truthful information 9 regarding his identity on all internet and e-mail communications, and not knowingly possess any 10 encryption technology or software designed to delete, conceal, protect or secure computer log 11 12 files or electronically stored data from the access of any law enforcement agency or probation officer. 13

The facts that led to the conviction are that on or about June 24, 2013, the c. 14 victim reported to the Corona Police Department that she was being stalked by a former 15 acquaintance (Respondent) she met in 2009 while she was employed as an exotic dancer at a 16 gentleman's club. The victim insisted they were only friends and that she never provided 17 Respondent with any personal information about herself except for the name of her favorite 18 author. By the fourth week, the victim started receiving telephone calls from Respondent. The 19 victim did not know how Respondent got her number and told him to stop calling her. 20 Respondent continued to contact the victim multiple times a day via telephone and text messages. 21 The victim blocked Respondent's telephone, but continued to get telephone calls from 22 Respondent. The victim changed her telephone number and contacted the Anaheim Police 23Department. Around this time, the victim stopped working at the club, however, Respondent 24 continued to stop by the club asking about her whereabouts. The victim returned to working at 25 the club in 2012. During one of her shifts, Respondent came to the club but the victim asked 26 security to deny him entrance. After her shift, she began receiving texts and telephone calls from 27 28 Respondent. The victim blocked Respondent's number and did not respond to his texts. The

5

victim started receiving telephone calls at all hours of the day and night from "blocked" telephone 1 numbers. Respondent called the victim's sister, who told him to stop calling her and the victim. 2 On June 22, 2013, the victim changed her telephone number for the second time to avoid 3 4 Respondent. The next day, the victim received a telephone call from a blocked number. When she returned the call, she discovered it was Respondent and hung up. Respondent sent the victim 5 6 multiple text messages, including one stating that he had mailed the victim a package containing 7 gifts for herself and her family. The victim provided law enforcement with contact information for Respondent. Respondent appeared for an interview with the Corona Police Department on 8 9 June 25, 2013. He admitted that he had been calling the victim, but claimed the victim provided him with her contact information and he did not understand why she contacted the police. On 10 July 1, 2013, Respondent signed a Consent to Search for his cell phones, computer and external 11 hard drives. A forensic examination of these items revealed that after many attempts to access 12 13 the victim's Verizon wireless account, Respondent was able to access the account on June 18, 2013. Respondent used paid internet search services to search for the victim's telephone number, 14 he mapped the victim's home address on Google Maps, he possessed photographs of the victim 15 downloaded from her Facebook account, and a Twitter account under the victim's name had been 16 created without her knowledge. 17

18

19

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Commission of Acts Involving Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit or Corruption) 14. Respondent has subjected his registration to discipline under section 4301(f) of the 20 Code for unprofessional conduct in that he used illegal means to obtain the personal identification 21 of another, and he impersonated another person through the internet, as described in paragraph 22 13, above, acts involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or corruption. 23

24

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

25

(July 22, 2009 Criminal Conviction for Violating a Restraining Order on April 20, 2009)

Respondent has subjected his registration to discipline under sections 490 and 4301(1) 26 15. of the Code in that he was convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, 27 duties, and functions of a pharmacy technician. The circumstances are as follows: 28

6

1	a. On or about July 22, 2009, in a criminal proceeding entitled <i>People of the State</i>		
2	of California v. Mark Kim Pham, in Riverside County Superior Court, case number RIM535387,		
3	Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to violating Penal Code section 166(a)(4), willful		
4	violation of a restraining order, a misdemeanor.		
5	b. As a result of the conviction, Respondent was granted summary probation for		
6	36 months, and ordered to serve 10 days in the custody of the Riverside County Sheriff's Office,		
7	pay fees, fines, and restitution, and not have any direct or indirect contact with the victim.		
8	PRAYER		
9	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,		
10	and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:		
11	1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician Registration Number TCH 74216,		
12	issued to Mark Kim Pham;		
13	2. Ordering Mark Kim Pham to pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable costs of the		
14	investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section		
15	125.3;		
16	3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.		
17	γ		
18	plate () - N/A		
19	DATED: 3/13/15 unie Leeld		
20	Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy		
21	Department of Consumer Affairs State of California		
22	Complainant		
23	SD2014708446		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	7		
	Accusation		