XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California KENT D. HARRIS Supervising Deputy Attorney General STANTON W. LEE Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 203563 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-9921 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 E-mail: Stanton.Lee@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant  BEFOL ROADD OF	
KENT D. HARRIS Supervising Deputy Attorney General STANTON W. LEE Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 203563 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-9921 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 E-mail: Stanton.Lee@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant  BEFO	
STANTON W. LEE Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 203563 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-9921 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 E-mail: Stanton.Lee@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant  BEFO	
Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 203563 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-9921 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 E-mail: Stanton.Lee@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant  BEFO	
1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-9921 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 E-mail: Stanton.Lee@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant  BEFO	
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-9921 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 E-mail: Stanton.Lee@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant  BEFO	
Telephone: (916) 445-9921 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 E-mail: Stanton.Lee@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant  BEFO	
E-mail: Stanton.Lee@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant  BEFOI	
BEFO	
	The first Part of Sarran
	PHARMACY
	CONSUMER AFFAIRS CALIFORNIA
	1
In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 6165
STEPHEN WAYNE BRANDT 1614 Camphor Way	
Lodi, CA 95242	ACCUSATION
Pharmacist License No. RPH 31823	
Respondent.	
•	
PAR	<u>etties</u>
1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) bring	gs this Accusation solely in her official capacity
as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharma	cy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs.
2. On or about April 4, 1978, the Board	l issued Pharmacist License Number RPH 31823
to Stephen Wayne Brandt (Respondent). The Ph	narmacist License was in full force and effect at
all times relevant to the charges brought herein a	and will expire on December 31, 2017, unless
renewed.	
JURISDICTION/STAT	<b>FUTORY PROVISIONS</b>
3. This Accusation is brought before th	e Board under the authority of the following
laws. All section references are to the Business	and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
///	
1 t a	Pharmacist License No. RPH 31823  Respondent.  Complainant alleges:  PAR  1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) bring as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharma  2. On or about April 4, 1978, the Board of Stephen Wayne Brandt (Respondent). The Phall times relevant to the charges brought herein a renewed.  JURISDICTION/STAT  3. This Accusation is brought before the

1	4. Section 4300 states, in pertinent part:
2	(a) Every license issued may be suspended or revoked.
3	(b) The board shall discipline the holder of any license issued by the board, whose default has been entered or whose case has been heard by the board and
4	found guilty, by any of the following methods:
5	(1) Suspending judgment.
6	(2) Placing him or her upon probation.
7	(3) Suspending his or her right to practice for a period not exceeding one year.
8	
9	(4) Revoking his or her license.
10	(5) Taking any other action in relation to disciplining him or her as the board in its discretion may deem proper
11	5. Section 4300.1 states:
12	The expiration, cancellation, forfeiture, or suspension of a board-issued
13	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
14	investigation of, or action or disciplinary proceeding against, the licensee or to render a decision suspending or revoking the license.
15	a decision suspending of revexing the meaner.
16	6. Section 4301 states, in pertinent part:
17	The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty
18	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:
19	not minted to, day of the following.
20	
21	(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
22	a licensee or otherwise, and whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not.
23	
24	(h) The administering to oneself, or any controlled substance, or the use of any dangerous drug or of alcoholic beverages to the extent or in a manner as to be
25	dangerous or injurious to oneself or to any other person or to the public
26	••••
27	(k) The conviction of more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any dangerous drug or
28	alcoholic beverage, or any combination of those substances.

2

3

5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

2627

28

(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 . . .

# FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Criminal Convictions)

7. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (1), in that on or about March 10, 2017, in the criminal proceeding entitled People vs. Stephen Brandt, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. LOD-CR-MDUI-2016-0015553, Respondent was convicted on his plea of nolo contendere of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (B) (driving under the influence of alcohol with a blood alcohol content of .08% or greater) and Vehicle Code section 20002(A) (hit and run with property damage), both misdemeanors. This conviction is for a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a pharmacist. The circumstances of the crime are as follows: on November 4, 2016, Lodi Police Department Officer A. Blythe was dispatched to the scene of a reported vehicle hit and run accident. While on route, Officer Blythe contacted the vehicle subject of the hit and run report disabled and facing the wrong direction of travel in the opposing lane of traffic. Officer Blythe observed the vehicles front bumper had become dislodged approximate 100 yards away from the vehicle and that it had significant front end damage. Upon contacting Respondent and speaking with him, Officer Blythe smelled a strong odor of alcohol emanating from Respondent and Officer Blythe observed Respondent to have

26

27

28

red/watery eyes, slurred speech, and slow responses to questions. When asked to exit the vehicle, Respondent was unable to stand on his own and the groin region of his pants appeared wet from urine. Based on Respondent's inability to stand, Respondent was arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol. A search of Respondent's vehicle resulted in the discovery of two empty 11.2 oz. bottles of beer on the front passenger floorboard. At the Lodi City Jail, Respondent consented to a breath test and returned blood alcohol content readings of 0.19% and 0.19%. After being Mirandized, Respondent admitted that he drank three 8 oz. glasses of Gin approximately 2-2.5 hours prior to his encounter with law enforcement.

8. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (1), in that on or about March 9, 2017, in the criminal proceeding entitled People vs. Stephen Wayne Brandt, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. DM090532A, Respondent was convicted on his plea of nolo contendere of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (A) (driving under the influence of alcohol), a misdemeanor. This conviction is for a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a pharmacist. The circumstances of the crime are as follows: on May 6, 2016, California Highway Patrol (CHP) Officer J. Cervantes responded to a dispatch call regarding a disabled vehicle with a possible intoxicated driver. Upon arriving at the scene, additional law enforcement officers had already responded to the scene. Officer Cervantes contacted Respondent whom he observed to have difficulty standing and nearly fall, requiring Officer Cervantes to provide assistance in walking Respondent to Officer Cervantes' patrol vehicle. Officer Cervantes detected the strong and distinct odor of alcohol on Respondent's breath and person and noted that Respondent's speech was heavily slurred. Upon questioning, Respondent admitted to Officer Cervantes that he had been traveling to Coalinga and was consuming "Negro Modelos," on the way. Officer Cervantes then instructed and demonstrated field sobriety tests for Respondent to repeat, which he failed to do. Respondent was arrested and consented to a chemical blood test which returned a blood alcohol level of 0.169%.

4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Negra Modelo is a beer.

### 

# 

#### 

### SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Multiple Convictions Involving Alcohol)

9. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (k), in that Respondent has had more than one misdemeanor conviction involving the use, consumption, or self-administration or alcohol as alleged in Paragraphs 7-8, above.

### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Dangerous Use of Alcohol)

10. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (h), in that Respondent has engaged in the dangerous use of alcohol to an extent dangerous or injurious to himself and others, as alleged in Paragraphs 7-8, above.

# FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Moral Turpitude)

11. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional pursuant to section 4301, subdivision (f), in that Respondent has engaged in conduct involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption as alleged in Paragraphs 7-8, above.

#### AGGRAVATING FACTORS

12. To determine the degree of discipline to be assessed against Respondent, if any, Complainant alleges that on January 30, 2017, the Board issued citation number CI 2016 73662 against Respondent in the amount of \$200. The citation charged Respondent with a violation under section 4301(g) for unprofessional conduct in that Respondent knowingly signed his license renewal application under penalty of perjury that falsely represented that he had completed 30 hours of continuing education knowing that he had not done so and had, in fact, only completed 25 hours. The citation also charged Respondent with violations under section 4231(d) and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1732.5, in that Respondent failed to provide documentation substantiating that he completed 30 hours of continuing education required for renewal of his license. Respondent paid his fine on February 9, 2017, and submitted

1	certificates substantiating the completion of five hours of continuing education after the deadline
2	period.
3	<u>PRAYER</u>
4	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,
5	and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:
6	1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacist License Number RPH 31823, issued to Stephen
7	Wayne Brandt;
8	2. Ordering Stephen Wayne Brandt to pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable costs
9	of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code
10	section 125.3; and,
11	3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.
12	
13	
14	7/16/17 Vieginia Skedd
15	DATED: 7/16/17 VIRGINIA HEROLD
16	Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy
17	Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
18	Complainant
19	SA2017107278
20	12736789.doc
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	