1		ſ
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California GREGORY J. SALUTE Supervising Deputy Attorney General DESIREE ICAZA KELLOGG Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 126461 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800 San Diego, CA 92101 P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 738-9415 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant  BEFOR BOARD OF P	HARMACY
11	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
12	T d M w Cd A d d	
	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 6638
13	OPTUMRX INC. DBA OPTUMRX	THIRD AMENDED ACCUSATION
14	2858 Loker Avenue East, Ste. 100 Carlsbad, CA 92010-6608	
15	Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 47482	
16 17	SHAWN JASON BJORNDAL 2858 Loker Ave East, Ste 100 Carlsbad, CA 92010-6608	
18 19	Pharmacist License No. RPH 65593	
20	Respondents.	
21		
22	Complement allegae	
	Complainant alleges:	
23	PARTIES	
24	1. Anne Sodergren (Complainant) brings this Third Amended Accusation solely in her	
25	official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer	
26	Affairs.	
27	///	
28	///	
		1

2. On or about March 22, 2006, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Permit			
Number PHY 47482 to OptumRx Inc., doing business as OptumRx (OptumRx). The Pharmacy			
Permit was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will			
expire on March 1, 2022, unless renewed.			

3. On or about July 27, 2011, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License Number RPH 65593 to Shawn Jason Bjorndal (Shawn Bjorndal). The Pharmacist License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on May 31, 2023, unless renewed.

#### **JURISDICTION**

- 4. This Third Amended 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.
- 5. Section 4011 of the Code provides that the Board shall administer and enforce both the Pharmacy Law [Bus. & Prof. Code, § 4000 et seq.] and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act [Health & Safety Code, § 11000 et seq.].
- 6. Section 4300(a) of the Code provides that every license issued by the Board may be suspended or revoked.
  - 7. 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 AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS

8. Section 733, subdivision (a) states:

A licentiate shall not obstruct a patient in obtaining a prescription drug or device that has been legally prescribed or ordered for that patient. A violation of this section constitutes unprofessional conduct by the licentiate and shall subject the licentiate to disciplinary or administrative action by his or her licensing agency.

//

#### 9. Section 4059.5, subdivision (e) states:

A dangerous drug or dangerous device shall not be transferred, sold, or delivered to a person outside this state, whether foreign or domestic, unless the transferor, seller, or deliverer does so in compliance with the laws of this state and of the United States and of the state or country to which the dangerous drugs or dangerous devices are to be transferred, sold, or delivered. Compliance with the laws of this state and the United States and of the state or country to which the dangerous drugs or dangerous devices are to be delivered shall include, but not be limited to, determining that the recipient of the dangerous drugs or dangerous devices is authorized by law to receive the dangerous drugs or dangerous devices.

#### 10. Section 4073, subdivision (c) states:

Selection pursuant to this section is within the discretion of the pharmacist, except as provided in subdivision (b). The person who selects the drug product to be dispensed pursuant to this section shall assume the same responsibility for selecting the dispensed drug product as would be incurred in filling a prescription for a drug product prescribed by generic name. There shall be no liability on the prescriber for an act or omission by a pharmacist in selecting, preparing, or dispensing a drug product pursuant to this section. In no case shall the pharmacist select a drug product pursuant to this section unless the drug product selected costs the patient less than the prescribed drug product. Cost, as used in this subdivision, is defined to include any professional fee that may be charged by the pharmacist.

# 11. Section 4113, subdivision (c) states:

The pharmacist-in-charge shall be responsible for a pharmacy's compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to the practice of pharmacy.

#### 12. Section 4301 states in pertinent part:

The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty of unprofessional conduct or whose license has been issued by mistake. Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

. . .

(o) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of or conspiring to violate any provision or term of this chapter or of the applicable federal and state laws and regulations governing pharmacy, including regulations established by the board or any other state or federal regulatory agency.

.

#### 13. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1707.3 states:

Prior to consultation as set forth in section 1707.2, a pharmacist shall review a patient's drug therapy and medication record before each prescription drug is delivered. The review shall include screening for severe potential drug therapy problems.

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24

25

2627

28

14. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1716 states:

Pharmacists shall not deviate from the requirements of a prescription except upon the prior consent of the prescriber or to elect the drug product in accordance with Section 4073 of the Business and Professions Code.

Nothing in this regulation is intended to prohibit a pharmacist from exercising commonly accepted pharmaceutical practice in the compounding or dispensing of a prescription.

15. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1761, subdivision (a) states:

No pharmacist shall compound or dispense any prescription which contains any significant error, omission, irregularity, uncertainty, ambiguity or alteration. Upon receipt of any such prescription, the pharmacist shall contact the prescriber to obtain the information needed to validate the prescription.

16. Connecticut General Statutes, Title 20, Chapter 400j, section 20-619, subdivision (i) states:

Upon the initial filling or renewal of a prescription that contains a statistical information code based upon the most recent edition of the International Classification of Diseases indicating the prescribed drug is used for the treatment of epilepsy or to prevent seizures, a pharmacist shall not fill the prescription by using a different drug manufacturer or distributor of the prescribed drug, unless the pharmacist (1) provides prior notice of the use of a different drug manufacturer or distributor to the patient and prescribing practitioner, and (2) obtains the written consent of the patient's prescribing practitioner. For purposes of obtaining the consent of the patient's prescribing practitioner required by this subsection, a pharmacist shall notify the prescribing practitioner via electronic mail or facsimile transmission. If the prescribing practitioner does not provide the necessary consent, the pharmacist shall fill the prescription without such substitution or use of a different drug manufacturer or distributor or return the prescription to the patient or to the patient's representative for filling at another pharmacy. If a pharmacist is unable to contact the patient's prescribing practitioner after making reasonable efforts to do so, such pharmacist may exercise professional judgment in refilling a prescription in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 20-616. For purposes of this subsection, "pharmacy" means a place of business where drugs and devices may be sold at retail and for which a pharmacy license was issued pursuant to section 20-594, including a hospital-based pharmacy when such pharmacy is filling prescriptions for employees and outpatient care, and a mail order pharmacy licensed by this state to distribute in this state. "Pharmacy" does not include a pharmacy serving patients in a long-term care facility, other institutional facility or a pharmacy that provides prescriptions for inpatient hospitals.

#### COST RECOVERY

17. 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.

10

11

8

13

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

#### DRUGS

- 18. Alprazolam is the generic for Xanax and is a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 11057, subdivision (d)(1) and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is used to treat anxiety.
- 19. Amiloride is the generic for Midador and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is a diuretic.
- 20. Atorvastatin is the generic for Lipitor and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is used to treat hypercholesteremia.
- 21. <u>Chlorthalidone</u> is the generic for Thalitone and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is used to treat hypertension.
- 22. Degludec insulin is the generic for Tresiba FlexTouch insulin injection and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is used to treat diabetes.
- 23. Dovonex is the brand name for calcipotriene and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is utilized to treat moderate plaque psoriasis.
- 24. <u>Lamotrigine ER</u> is the generic for Lamictal XR and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is utilized to prevent seizures.
- 25. Lomedia 24 FE is the generic for Larin 24 FE and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is utilized to prevent pregnancies.
- 26. Proscar is the brand name for finasteride and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is utilized to treat alopecia and benign prostatic hyperplacia.
- <u>Pravachol</u> is the brand name for pravastatin and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is utilized to treat hypercholesteremia.
- 28. Synthroid is the brand name for levothyroxine and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is utilized to treat hypothyroidism.
- 29. <u>Victoza</u> is the brand name for liraglutide and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is utilized to treat type 2 diabetes.

26

27

28

30. <u>Venlafaxine</u> is the generic for Effexor and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is used to treat depression.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

31. Since January 3, 2017, Shawn Bjorndal has been the Pharmacist-in-Charge (PIC) of OptumRx. At all relevant times herein, PIC Bjorndal and OptumRx (collectively Respondents) dispensed prescription drugs to patients via mail or overnight delivery services. Respondents dispensed drugs to the following patients as described below.

# Patient Edward F.

32. On or about December 5, 2018, Edward F.'s physician wrote Edward F. a prescription with refills for 90 tablets of amiloride 5mg and 90 tablets of venlafaxine XR 150mg. On May 9, 2019, Edward F.'s physician wrote Edward F. a prescription with refills for 90 tablets of atorvastatin 20mg. On January 7, 2019, Edward F.'s physician wrote Edward F. a prescription with refills for 90 tablets of chlorthalidone 50mg. On September 3, 2019, Edward F. requested a refill of these four drugs from Respondent OptumRx via its automated telephone system. Respondents did not immediately dispense these prescriptions. On September 13, 2019, Edward F. ran out of venlafaxine (used to treat depression) and atorvastatin. Edward F. understood venlafaxine was for depression and should be taken regularly without missing a dose. Therefore, on September 13, 2019, when he did not receive his medications and ran out of venlafaxine and atorvastatin, he called Respondent OptumRx. Respondents' customer service representative told him that Respondent OptumRx would expedite the dispensing of his medications to him. However, Respondents did not expedite the processing of Edward F.'s medications. On September 18, 2019, 15 days after placing the order for them and five days after he ran out of venlafaxine and atorvastatin, Edward F. received refills of amiloride, venlafaxine, atorvastatin and chlorthalidone from Respondents.

#### Patient Sun P.

33. Sun P. was located in the State of Connecticut. On or about February 22, 2018, Sun P.'s physician wrote Sun P. a prescription for 360 tablets of lamotrigine ER 200mg with refills in order to treat his epilepsy and prevent seizures, and the prescription specified that it should be

manufactured by PAR (Rx No. 197290325). Sun P. and/or his physician submitted that prescription to Respondents for dispensing. On or about March 6, 2018, Respondents dispensed and caused to be delivered Sun P.'s prescription of lamotrigine ER 200mg which was manufactured by TruPharma rather than PAR, without providing prior notice of the dispensing of a different manufacturer to Sun P. and his physician and without obtaining the written consent of Sun P.'s physician to a change in manufacturer. This was a violation of the laws of the State of Connecticut. Sun P.'s physician did not consent to the change in manufacturer of lamotrigine ER.

#### Patient Ken N.

34. On or about November 1, 2017, Patient Ken N.'s physician wrote Ken N. a prescription with refills for 90 tablets of pravastatin 20mg, in order to treat his hypercholesteremia (Rx No. 187696324). Ken N. and/or his physician submitted that prescription to Respondents for dispensing. On or about May 9, 2018, Respondents dispensed Ken N.'s prescription with an alopecia drug, finasteride 5mg, instead of pravastatin 20mg. Respondents' verification process did not catch this medication error.

# Patient Joseph H.

35. On or about March 1, 2018, Joseph H.'s physician wrote Joseph H. a prescription for 12 grams of 0.005% Dovonex cream with a refill, to treat his psoriasis (Rx No. 197939463). Joseph H. and/or his physician submitted that prescription to Respondents for dispensing. However, Respondents did not have 0.005% Dovonex cream 12mg tubes in stock. Accordingly, on or about March 1, 2018, Respondent processed and dispensed two 60 gram tubes of the generic of 0.005% Dovonex cream (calcipotriene) with a co-insurance amount of \$228.02. Respondents did not clarify the quantity or grams of Dovonex needed by Joseph H. with his prescriber prior to dispensing 120 grams of Dovonex cream.

#### Patient Cheri M.

36. On or about January 11, 2018, Cheri M.'s physician wrote Cheri M. a prescription for a Victoza 2-pak 0.6mg/0.1mL (18mg/3mL) subcutaneous pen injector to treat her diabetes (Rx No. 193789662). Cheri M. and/or her physician submitted that prescription to Respondents for dispensing. However, Respondents did not fill her prescription at that time. On or about

February 12, 2018, Cheri M. contacted Respondents because she had not received her medication and requested her medication. Respondents created an order but cancelled it. On or about February 14, 2018, Cheri M. contacted Respondents again because she had not received her medication and requested her medication again. Respondents created an order but cancelled it. On or about February 16, 2018, Cheri M. contacted Respondents to inquire about the status of her medication. Respondents filled her prescription on February 20, 2018. Consequently, Cheri M. did not have her type 2 diabetes medication for approximately two weeks.

#### Patient Shannon W.

37. On or about December 26, 2017, Shannon W.'s physician wrote Shannon W. a prescription for 90 tablets of Synthroid 50mcg to treat her hypothyroidism (Rx. No. 191835776). On or about February 14, 2018, Shannon W. requested that Respondents fill her prescription for Synthroid. However, Respondents did not fill her prescription. On or about February 20, 2018, Shannon W. contacted Respondent to inquire about the status of her medication. Respondents ultimately filled her medication on February 22, 2018. Consequently, Shannon W. did not have her hypothyroidism medication for approximately two weeks.

### Patient Isha B.

38. On or about June 8, 2016, Isha B.'s physician wrote Isha B. a prescription for 90 tablets of the brand name drug, Larin 24 FE to prevent pregnancies (Rx No. 155869767). Isha B. and/or her physician submitted the prescription to OptumRx. Due to Isha B.'s insurance plan, the brand name, Larin 24FE was less expensive than the generic, Lomedia 24 FE. On June 8, 2016, OptumRx processed, filled and dispensed Lomedia 24 FE to Isha B. and charged her \$204.14 for that medication when there was a zero co-pay for dispensing the brand, Larin 24 FE.

## Patient Robert P.

39. Robert P. was a newly diagnosed insulin dependent diabetic. On or about August 28, 2020, Robert P's physician wrote Robert P. a new prescription for Tresiba in order to change the directions for use on his diabetic medication and transmitted it to Respondents. Robert P.'s physician was calibrating or titrating his medication and was increasing Robert P.'s dosage until Robert P.'s blood sugar was controlled. Respondents did not acknowledge receipt of the

prescription or fill it. Meanwhile, Robert P. checked on the status of his prescription via computer repeatedly, but received no update on the status of his prescription.

- 40. On September 1, 2020, Robert P. made multiple telephone calls to OptumRx, but had a difficult time speaking with any employee, including a pharmacist. Robert P. eventually spoke with a supervisor. Robert P. advised the OptumRx supervisor that he was running out of his Tresiba medication and that his physician had changed the directions for taking his Tresiba because his blood sugar was not sufficiently controlled. The OptumRx representative told Robert P. that OptumRx could not fill his prescription for Tresiba because it was too early to fill and that the cost of his medication had been denied by his insurance carrier.
- 41. A pharmacist did not review Robert P.'s Drug Utilization Review prior to Respondents' decision not to fill Robert P.'s prescription. Since Robert P. was almost out of Tresiba, he was forced to obtain a sample of it from his physician and a new prescription that was filled at a retail pharmacy.

# Patient Laura K.

42. On August 21, 2020, Laura K. requested a refill of alprazolam. On August 23, 2020, Laura K.'s physician transmitted a prescription for alprazolam to Respondents which was placed on a "hold" because the computer system calculated a 7.5 day supply, instead of an eight day supply for "claims adjudication." Commencing on or about August 27, 2020, Laura K.'s husband contacted OptumRx five times to inquire about the status of his wife's prescription and received five different stories. None of the employees correctly identified why Laura K.'s prescription was on "hold" or released the "hold" until September 2, 2020. The prescription for alprazolam was not furnished to Laura K. until September 4, 2020. Consequently, Laura K. did not have her anxiety medication for approximately two weeks.

# FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

#### (Obstructing Patients in Obtaining Prescription Drugs)

43. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for violating Code section 733, subdivision (a) in that they obstructed patients from obtaining their

prescription drugs, as set forth in paragraphs 31 through 42 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

#### **SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

## (Failing to Comply with Laws of Another State when Delivering Drugs)

44. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for violating Code section 4059.5, subdivision (e) in that they failed to comply with the laws of another state when delivering drugs to a patient in that state, as set forth in paragraphs 31 through 42 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

# THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Substituting More Expensive Drug against Respondent OptumRx Only)

45. Respondent OptumRx is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for violating Code section 4073, subdivision (c) in that it substituted a more expensive generic drug for the less expensive brand name of that drug, as set forth in paragraphs 31 through 42 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

# **FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

#### (Deviating from Prescription Requirements)

46. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for violating California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1716, subdivision (a) in that they deviated from the requirements of a prescription, as set forth in paragraphs 31 through 42 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

#### FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

#### (Failing to Validate Uncertain Prescription)

47. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for violating California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1761, subdivision (a) in that they dispensed an uncertain prescription, without contacting the prescriber to obtain the information needed to validate the prescription, as set forth in paragraphs 31 through 42 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

///

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

### SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Failure to Review Drug Therapies)

48. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301, subdivisions (j) and (o), for violating California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1707.3, in that they failed to review patients' drug therapy and medication records and take appropriate actions, prior to consultation and the delivery of drugs, as set forth in paragraphs 31 through 42, which are incorporated herein.

## **SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

#### (Unprofessional Conduct)

49. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301 for unprofessional conduct, in that they engaged in the unprofessional activities described in paragraphs 31 through 42 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

#### DISCIPLINE CONSIDERATIONS

- 50. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondents, Complainant alleges that:
- a. On or about January 23, 2017, in a prior disciplinary action entitled *In the Matter of the Accusation Against OptumRx, Inc., dba OptumRx*, Case Number 5413 before the Board, OptumRx's license was publically reproved by the Board under Business and Professions Code section 494 for unprofessional conduct and violations of Business and Professions Code section 733, subdivision (a), obstructing patients in obtaining prescription drugs. That decision is now final and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.
- b. On or about July 26, 2017, in case number Cl 2016 74253, the Board issued a Letter of Admonishment to Shawn Bjorndal pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4315 for violating Business and Professions Code section 4073, subdivision (b), dispensing an unauthorized substitution of a generic drug and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1717.4, subdivision (h) and Health & Safety Code section 11164, subdivision (b)(1), in that he failed to validate the security, integrity and authority of controlled substances prescriptions while employed at another pharmacy.

- c. On or about July 3, 2018, in case number C1 2017 80410, the Board issued a Letter of Admonishment to Shawn Bjorndal pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4315 for violating Business and Professions Code section 733, in that he obstructed the dispensing of prescription drugs.
- d. On or about February 10, 2021, the Board issued Citation number CI 2018 84425 against OptumRx for engaging in unprofessional conduct in that it obstructed a patient from speaking to a pharmacist, then referred the patient to a pharmacist not licensed in California and located at a call center which was not licensed in California as a non-resident pharmacy. The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.
- e. On or about February 10, 2021, the Board issued Citation number CI 2020 90096 against Shawn Jason Bjorndal for engaging in unprofessional conduct, in that he obstructed a patient from speaking to a pharmacist, then referred the patient to a pharmacist not licensed in California and located at a call center which was not licensed in California as a non-resident pharmacy. Shawn Jason Bjorndal did not appeal the Citation.
- f. On or about September 18, 2018, the Board issued Citation number CI 2016 75859 against OptumRx for violating California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1716, deviating from the requirements of a prescription. The Board issued a fine that OptumRX paid.
- g. On or about September 13, 2018, the Board issued Citation number CI 2017 77718 against OptumRx for engaging in acts of dishonesty as defined by Business and Professions Code section 4301, subdivision (f). The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.
- h. On or about July 3, 2018, the Board issued Citation number CI 2017 76295 against OptumRx for violating Business and Professions Code section 733, subdivision (a), in that it obstructed the dispensing of prescriptions drugs. The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.
- i. On or about December 1, 2017, the Board issued Citation number CI 2015 70397 against OptumRx for violating California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1716, deviating from the requirements of a prescription.

27 | ///

28 | ///

- j. On or about June 12, 2017, the Board issued Citation number CI 2015 69556 against OptumRx for violating Business and Professions Code section 733, subdivision (a), in that it obstructed the dispensing of prescription drugs. The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.
- k. On or about June 8, 2017, the Board issued Citation number CI 2015 69919 against OptumRx for violating Business and Professions Code section 733, subdivision (a) in that it obstructed the dispensing of prescription drugs. The Board issued a fine that OptumRX paid.
- 1. On or about April 8, 2015, the Board issued Citation number CI 2013 60163 against OptumRx for violating Business and Professions Code section 733, subdivision (a) in that it obstructed the dispensing of prescription drugs. The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.
- m. On or about February 9, 2015, the Board issued Citation number CI 2013 60075 against OptumRx for incompetence as defined by Business and Professions Code section 4301, subdivision (b). The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.
- n. On July 9, 2014, the Board issued Citation number CI 2013 59891 against OptumRx for violating Business and Professions Code section 733, subdivision (a) in that it obstructed the dispensing of prescription drugs.
- o. On January 23, 2014, the Board issued Citation number CI 2012 54362 against OptumRx for violating Business and Professions Code section 733, subdivision (a) in that it obstructed the dispensing of prescription drugs and devices and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1716 for deviating from the requirements of a prescription without the prior consent of the prescriber. The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.
- p. On April 11, 2014, the Board issued Citation number CI 2013 58107 against OptumRx for violating Civil Code section 56.10, subdivision (a) and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1764 in that there was the unauthorized release of protected healthcare information. The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.
- q. On February 14, 2013, the Board issued Citation number CI 2012 53121 against OptumRx for violating California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1716 in that it dispensed a prescription without clarifying the dose with the prescriber. The Board issued a fine that OptumRx paid.