|    | ·   |  |  |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1  | KAMALA D. HARRIS  |  |  |  |  |
| 2  | Attorney General of California JANICE K. LACHMAN  |  |  |  |  |
| 3  | Supervising Deputy Attorney General KRISTINA T. JARVIS                                      |  |  |  |  |
| 4  | Deputy Attorney General<br>State Bar No. 258229   |  |  |  |  |
| 5  | 1300 I Street, Suite 125<br>P.O. Box 944255   |  |  |  |  |
| 6  | Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 324-5403   |  |  |  |  |
| 7  | Facsimile: (916) 327-8643 Attorneys for Complainant   |  |  |  |  |
| 8  | BEFORE THE  |  |  |  |  |
| 9  | BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA   |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. 5555                                      |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | MAIN STREET FAMILY PHARMACY LLC A C C U S A T I O N   |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 126 E. Main Street<br>Newbern, TN 38059   |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Original Non-Resident Pharmacy Permit No.   |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | NRP 1138 Original Non-Resident Pharmacy Permit No.  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | NSC 99696   |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Respondent.   |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |   |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Complainant alleges:  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | <u>PARTIES</u>  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | 1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.             |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | 2. On or about December 20, 2011, the Board of Pharmacy issued Original Non-                |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | Resident Pharmacy Permit Number NRP 1138 to Main Street Family Pharmacy LLC                 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | (Respondent). The Original Non-Resident Pharmacy Permit was cancelled on February 18, 2014, |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | due to a discontinuance of business effective December 20, 2013.                            |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | 3. On or about February 17, 2005, the Board of Pharmacy issued Original Non-Resident        |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | Pharmacy Permit Number NSC 99696 to Respondent. The Original Non-Resident Pharmacy          |  |  |  |  |
|    | 1   |  |  |  |  |
|    | ( MAIN STREET FAMILY PHARMACY LLC) ACCUSATION   |  |  |  |  |

| 1              | Permit was cancelled on February 18, 2014, due to a discontinuance of business effective   |  |  |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| 2              | December 20, 2013.   |  |  |
| 3              | <u>JURISDICTION</u>  |  |  |
| 4              | 4. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of  |  |  |
| 5              | Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the   |  |  |
| 6              | Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.  |  |  |
| 7              | STATUTORY PROVISIONS   |  |  |
| 8              | 5. Section 4300 of the Code states in pertinent part:  |  |  |
| 9              | "(a) Every license issued may be suspended or revoked.   |  |  |
| 10             | "(b) The board shall discipline the holder of any license issued by the board, whose default   |  |  |
| 11             |  |  |  |
| 12             |  |  |  |
| 13             | "(1) Suspending judgment.  |  |  |
| 14             | "(2) Placing him or her upon probation.  |  |  |
| 15             | "(3) Suspending his or her right to practice for a period not exceeding one year.  |  |  |
| 16             | "(4) Revoking his or her license.  |  |  |
| 17  <br>18     | "(5) Taking any other action in relation to disciplining him or her as the board in its discretion may deem proper"  |  |  |
| 9              | 6. Section 4300.1 of the Code states:  |  |  |
| 20             | "The expiration, cancellation, forfeiture, or suspension of a board-issued license by operation  |  |  |
| 21             | of law or by order or decision of the board or a court of law, the placement of a license on a   |  |  |
| 22             | 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   |  |  |
| 23             | against, the licensee or to render a decision suspending or revoking the license."   |  |  |
| 24             | 7. Section 4301 of the Code states in pertinent part:  |  |  |
| 25<br>26<br>27 | "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: |  |  |
| 28             | "(n) The revocation, suspension, or other discipline by another state of a license to practic pharmacy, operate a pharmacy, or do any other act for which a license is required by this chapte   |  |  |

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

specifications. The Quality Assurance Program shall include at least the following:

- "(1) Cleaning and sanitization of the parenteral medication preparation area.
- "(4) Written justification of the chosen expiration dates for compounded sterile injectable products.
- "(b) Each individual involved in the preparation of sterile injectable products must first successfully complete a validation process on technique before being allowed to prepare sterile injectable products. The validation process shall be carried out in the same manner as normal production, except that an appropriate microbiological growth medium is used in place of the actual product used during sterile preparation. The validation process shall be representative of all types of manipulations, products and batch sizes the individual is expected to prepare. The same personnel, procedures, equipment, and materials must be involved. Completed medium samples must be incubated. If microbial growth is detected, then the sterile preparation process must be evaluated, corrective action taken, and the validation process repeated. Personnel competency must be revalidated at least every twelve months, whenever the quality assurance program yields an unacceptable result, when the compounding process changes, equipment used in the compounding of sterile injectable drug products is repaired or replaced, the facility is modified in a manner that affects airflow or traffic patterns, or whenever improper aseptic techniques are observed. Revalidation must be documented.
- "(c) Batch-produced sterile injectable drug products compounded from one or more nonsterile ingredients shall be subject to documented end product testing for sterility and pyrogens and shall be quarantined until the end product testing confirms sterility and acceptable levels of pyrogens.
- "(d) Batch-produced sterile to sterile transfers shall be subject to periodic testing through process validation for sterility as determined by the pharmacist-in-charge and described in the written policies and procedures."
  - 21. California Code of Regulations, title 24, section 1250.4 states in pertinent part:

"The pharmacy shall have a designated area for the preparation of sterile products for dispensing which shall:

"2. Have nonporous and cleanable surfaces, ceilings and ceiling tiles, walls, floors and floor coverings."

## **COST RECOVERY**

22. Section 125.3 of the Code states, 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.

///

# FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Out of State Discipline)

- 23. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (n), in that on or about March 13, 2013, in case number L12-PHR-RBS-2013000051, Respondent's pharmacy license was disciplined by the Tennessee State Board of Pharmacy by consent decree and placed on probation. The circumstances are that on December 6, 2011, Tennessee Board of Pharmacy inspectors observed the following violations of Tennessee pharmacy laws:
- a. The condition of the laminar flow hood at Respondent's facility was not compliant with Board regulations;
  - b. 89 outdated or deteriorated medications were found on pharmacy shelves;
- c. Respondent's facility had shipped 11 compounded prescriptions directly to physician's offices for use; however, none of those prescriptions were patient-specific as required by Board rules; and
- d. a nurse had been working as a pharmacy technician in Respondent's facility without proper registration for 4 years and 3 months.
- 24. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (n), in that on or about December 23, 2013, in case number 2013-07092, Respondent's Non-Resident Pharmacy permit Number PH 24815 was disciplined by the Florida State Board of Pharmacy in that Respondent voluntarily relinquished its Non-Resident Pharmacy permit. The circumstances are that Respondent's license had been disciplined by the Tennessee Board of Pharmacy as set forth in paragraph 23, above, for one or more offenses that would also constitute a violation of Florida Board of Pharmacy Laws, Rules, or Regulations.
- 25. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (n), in that on or about October 10, 2013, in case number 2013-80, Respondent's Nonresident Pharmacy License Number 3941, was disciplined by the Iowa State Board of Pharmacy in that Respondent's license was revoked by voluntary surrender. The circumstances are that Respondent's license had been disciplined by the Tennessee Board of

Pharmacy as set forth in paragraph 23, above. Further, Respondent issued a voluntary nationwide recall of all lots of sterile products compounded by Respondent with beyond-use dates of 11-20-13 or sooner. Five Iowa patients received compounded medications subject to the recall.

- 26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (n), in that on or about July 16, 2014, in case number 2013003822, Respondent's Pharmacy License was disciplined by the Illinois State Board of Pharmacy by being placed on probation by consent decree. The circumstances are that Respondent's license had been disciplined by the Tennessee Board of Pharmacy as set forth in paragraph 23, above.
- 27. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (n), in that on or about October 2, 2013, in case number 2013-2009, Respondent's Non-Resident Prescription Drug Outlet Registration License No. OSP 5914 was disciplined by the Colorado State Board of Pharmacy by a stipulation for interim cessation of practice until such time as future administrative actions are taken against the licensee. During the stipulation period, Respondent's license in Colorado expired and has not been renewed.
- 28. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (n), in that on or about September 11, 2013, in case number 0002599, Respondent's Pharmacy License No. 587-43 was disciplined by the Wisconsin Pharmacy Examining Board in that Respondent's license was revoked by stipulation for voluntary surrender. The circumstances are that Respondent's license had been disciplined by the Tennessee Board of Pharmacy as set forth in paragraph 23, above.

#### SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Violation of Regulations Governing Pharmacy)

- 29. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (o), in that between May 22, 2013, and June 3, 2013, Respondent's facilities were inspected by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and found to have violated regulations governing the practice of pharmacy. The circumstances are as follows:
- a. Respondent violated Regulation 1714, subdivision (b), by failing to maintain its facilities, space, fixtures, and equipment so that drugs can be safely prepared as follows:

- The ante room for employees entering the clean room is inadequate in size to allow proper gowning.
- ii. No mirror is available to ensure full hair net coverage.
- iii. No space is provided for sterile glove donning.
- iv. The water faucet for employees to sterilize their hands prior to entering the clean room is not hands-free.
- b. Respondent violated Regulation 1714, subdivision (c), by failing to maintain its facilities free from insects. Two (2) spiders were observed inside the clean room.
- c. Respondent violated Regulation 1735.2, subdivision (g), by failing to maintain records establishing hold times for compounded sterile products between processing steps. No records existed to document hold times between filling finished product vials from bulk vials, and Respondent's management employees stated that the time could vary from immediately up to two (2) days.
- d. Respondent violated Regulation 1735.2, subdivision (h), and Regulation 1751.7, subdivision (a)(4), by failing to maintain written documentation regarding expiration dates, and the Pharmacist's reasoning and justification for the chosen expiration date for compounded sterile injectable products. Specifically, Respondent assigned a 3-month expiration date for all preservative-free compounded sterile injectable products, and a 6-month expiration date for all compounded sterile injectable products with preservatives. Respondent had no alternative stability data for these products, which indicates both products should have expiration dates of no longer than forty-five (45) days.
- e. Respondent violated Regulation 1735.3, subdivisions (a)(3), (a)(4), and (a)(7), and Regulation 1751.7, subdivisions (a), (c), and (d), by failing to provide required information in compounding records for both sterile and non-sterile compounding. Specifically:
  - Respondent failed to provide the identification of the persons performing and checking each significant step in the compounding and sterile compounding operations.

///

- ii. Respondent calibrated scales on an infrequent basis using an uncertified, single 100 gram weight, without any documentation maintained of calibration activities. Further, no linearity tests were conducted for the scales.
- i. Respondent violated Regulation 1735.8, subdivision (c), in that Respondent failed to follow an appropriate standard operating procedure for potency testing. Respondent's SOP number 9.018 stated Respondent was to do random testing at the discretion of the Pharmacist-In-Charge; however, as of June 3, 2013, no testing had been done since December, 2012. Further, random testing does not meet the scientifically justifiable basis required for potency testing. The SOP further stated that every lot of compounded medroxyprogesterone/lidocaine (MPL) injection should be assayed for medroxyprogesterone potency. Three (3) lots of MPL were sold to physicians in California without any potency testing.
- j. Respondent violated Regulation 1735.8, subdivision (d), in that Respondent failed to investigate quality assurance results which exceeded specifications for quantitative testing. On or about August 14, 2012, Respondent submitted three (3) vials of MPL for potency testing. One of the vials showed it had 125.98% of the labeled strength. The specifications for this product can range from 90% to 110%, but 125.98% far exceeds the acceptable range. Respondent's SOP numbers 9.005.1, and 9.014 stated an investigation would be performed, the improper lots would be destroyed, and appropriate action taken to ensure the error did not recur. Respondent failed to follow their SOPs, no investigation was performed, the improper lots were not destroyed and were sold to physicians, and no action was taken to ensure the error did not recur.
- k. Respondent violated Regulation 1751, subdivision (b)(2), by failing to have or maintain a designated area for preparation of sterile injectable products meeting the standards set forth in Regulation 1250.4, with walls, ceilings, and floors made of nonporous and cleanable surfaces. Respondent's facilities had the following violations:
  - The floor in the clean room was composed of pieces of flooring joined by caulking. The caulking was worn away, creating a crack in the floor of the clean room.

| ii. | The ceiling above the ante room was open to an uncontrolled           |
|-----|---|
|     | environment, and there was exposed insulation directly above the door |
|     | into the ante room.   |

- l. Respondent violated Regulation 1751, subdivision (b)(5), by failing to store items relating to sterile compounding in such a way as to maintain the integrity of an aseptic environment. Vials intended for use for injectable drug products were observed to be stored open to the environment for multiple hours inside a laminar airflow hood used for compounding sterile injectable drug products. The laminar airflow hood was not in use at the time, and no drug product was processed during this period. Further, this was a violation of Respondent's Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) number 8.034, item #10, which states to only place the necessary supplies for immediate drug preparation in the laminar airflow hood and on the laminar airflow workbench, and not to use the laminar airflow workbench to store items.
- m. Respondent violated Regulation 1751.1, subdivision (b)(4), in that Respondent failed to have or maintain records of cleaning, disinfection, or maintenance for any of the laminar airflow hoods.
- n. Respondent violated Regulation 1751.4, subdivision (a), in that Respondent failed to clean, or failed to appropriately clean, equipment prior to placing it in the sterile compounding environment. Specifically
  - i. During the sterile compounding process for Total Parenteral Nutrition (TPN), components were brought into the clean room from the uncontrolled environment rooms and placed on the work surface of laminar airflow hood #3 without being disinfected with sterile isopropyl alcohol.
  - ii. During the sterile compounding process for Human Chorionic Gonadotropin (HCG), components were brought into the clean room from the uncontrolled environment rooms and placed on the work surface of laminar airflow hood #3 without being disinfected with sterile isopropyl alcohol.
  - iii. Prior to beginning the sterile compounding process, Respondent used wipes that were not sterile to clean the laminar airflow hood workbench.

- o. Respondent violated Regulation 1751.4, subdivision (b), and Regulation 1751.5, subdivision (b)(1), by failing to limit access to the clean room to properly attired individuals, which includes removal of all cosmetics and jewelry or piercings that cannot be covered by personal protective equipment. Specifically:
  - i. During the sterile compounding process for TPN and HCG, Respondent's employee wore a non-sterile gown and surgeons mask which left facial areas exposed. Respondent's SOP number 7.011 requires sterile, non-shedding gowns be used in the clean room.
  - ii. During the sterile compounding process for TPN and HCG, Respondent's employee had exposed legs, visible eye make-up, and studded earrings that were not covered by personal protective equipment.
- p. Respondent violated Regulation 1751.4, subdivision (d), in that Respondent failed to properly clean and disinfect the ante room weekly, and after any unanticipated event that could increase the risk of contamination. There were stains on the floor of the ante room while Respondent's employees were compounding sterile injectable products.
- q. Respondent violated Regulation 1751.7, subdivision (a), by failing to practice appropriate quality assurance measures for sterile compounding equipment, including ongoing monitoring of personnel performance, equipment, and facilities. Specifically:
  - i. No biological indicators were used, and no load mapping studies were conducted to determine proper load configuration of the autoclave.
  - ii. No positive or negative indicators were used to test the incubator.
  - iii. Smoke studies of the clean room and laminar airflow hoods were not documented.
  - iv. The lyophilization unit was not validated.
  - v. Expired filters used for aseptic sterilization of drug products were stored intermixed with in-date filters intended for use.
- r. Respondent violated Regulation 1751.7, subdivision (b), by failing to ensure that process validation for compounding staff was representative of common compounding activities,

///

| 1        | 4. Taking such other and     | I further action as deemed necessary and proper.                     |
|----------|------------------------------|--|
| 1<br>2   | <u> </u>                     | action as deented necessary and proper.                              |
| 3        | DATED: 7/11/16               | Orginia Hedd   |
| 4        | DATED.                       | VIRGINIA HEROLD Executive Officer                                    |
| 5        |                              | Board of Pharmacy Department of Consumer Affairs State of California |
| 6        |                              | State of California  Complainant                                     |
| 7        |                              | ·  |
| 8        |                              |  |
| 9        |                              |  |
| 10       |                              |  |
| 11       |                              |  |
| 12       |                              |  |
| 13       |                              |  |
| 14       |                              |  |
| 15       |                              |  |
| 16<br>17 |                              |  |
| 18       |                              |  |
| 19       |                              | ·  |
| 20       |                              |  |
| 21       |                              |  |
| 22       |                              |  |
| 23       |                              |  |
| 24       |                              |  |
| 25       |                              |  |
| 26       |                              |  |
| 27       |                              |  |
| 28       | SA2015105022<br>12057029.doc |  |
|          |                              | 17   |