1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BOARD OF DEPARTMENT OF O	RE THE PHARMACY ONSUMER AFFAIRS
9	STATE OF C	CALIFORNIA
10 11	In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:	Case No. 3921
12	SPECIALTY PHARMACEUTICALS,	
13	INC.; FARAMARZ GANJIAN, AKA FRED GANJIAN; CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL	STATEMENT OF ISSUES
14	HALL 6901 Canby #108	
15	Reseda, CA 91335 Applicant for Pharmacy Permit	
16	Respondents.	
17	·	
18		·
19	Complainant alleges:	
20	<u>PARTIES</u>	
21	1. Virginia K. Herold (Complainant) brings this Statement of Issues solely in her official	
22	capacity as the Executive Officer of the California State Board of Pharmacy.	
23	2. On or about August 24, 2010, the California State Board of Pharmacy received an	
24	application for an Applicant for Pharmacy Permit from Specialty Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Faramarz	
25	Ganjian, aka Fred Ganjian; Christopher Michael Hall (Respondents). On or about August 2,	
26	2010, Faramarz Ganjian certified under penalty of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements,	
. 27	answers, and representations in the application. The California State Board of Pharmacy denied	
28	the application on October 26, 2010.	
		1

1

3. On or about January 21, 2005, the California State Board of Pharmacy issued Original Pharmacist License Number RPH 56740 to respondent Faramarz Ganjian. Said license will expire on February 28, 2011, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

- 4. This Statement of Issues is brought before the California 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 4300, subdivision (c) of the Code states that the Board may refuse a license to any applicant guilty of unprofessional conduct.
 - 6. 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:

(l) 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.

America v. Faramarz Ganjian (United States District Court, Southern District of New York, 1993, Case No. 92 Cr. 943).

a. The circumstances of the crime were that respondent Ganjian, who was a licensed pharmacist, participated in a prescription drug diversion scheme by purchasing non-controlled prescription drugs from an illegal or improper source. Respondent Ganjian then resold and/or dispensed the drugs to unsuspecting consumers.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Discipline in Other States)

- 10. Respondents' application is subject to denial under section 4301, subdivision (l) in that disciplinary action was taken against respondent Ganjian in other states as follows:
- a. On or about December 18, 1992, in a proceeding entitled *In the Matter of the Disciplinary Proceeding Against FARAMARZ GANJIAN (Pharmacist)*, Case No. 13494, before the New York State Education Department, Office of Professional Discipline, State Board of Pharmacy, respondent Ganjian surrendered his license to practice pharmacy in the State of New York and paid a fine of two thousand five hundred dollars and no cents (\$2,500.00). Respondent Ganjian agreed to surrender his license and admitted that he committed acts of unprofessional conduct and gross negligence by holding for sale and offering for sale misbranded drugs and repacked drugs and purchasing drugs outside the proper channels of distribution of prescription-required drugs. Complainant refers to and by this reference incorporates the allegations set forth above in paragraph 8, inclusive, as though set forth fully.

On or about July 20, 1998, in Case No. 98-15-20, respondent Ganjian's license to practice pharmacy in the State of New York was reinstated and he was placed on five (5) years probation with terms and conditions.

b. On or about March 7, 1994, in a proceeding entitled *In the Matter of Faramarz*Ganjian, Pharmacy File No. 93-6, Docket No. 94-16, before the State of Connecticut,

Commission of Pharmacy, respondent Ganjian surrendered his Connecticut pharmacist license

based on the disciplinary action and surrender of his pharmacist license in the State of New York.

<u>2</u>7

Complainant refers to and by this reference incorporates the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 8 and 9, inclusive, as though set forth fully.

On or about November 3, 1998, in Pharmacy File No. 98-48, Docket No. 98-600, respondent Ganjian's license to practice pharmacy in the State of Connecticut was reinstated and he was placed on five (5) years probation with terms and conditions.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Acts Involving Dishonesty, Fraud or Deceit with

Intent to Substantially Benefit Himself or Substantially Injure Another)

11. Respondents' application is subject to denial under section 480, subdivision (a), subparagraph (2) in that respondent Ganjian committed acts which involved dishonesty, fraud, or deceit with the intent to substantially benefit himself or another, or substantially injure another. Complainant refers to and by this reference incorporates the allegations set forth above in paragraph 8, inclusive, as though set forth fully.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Acts If Done By Licentiate Constitute Grounds for Suspension or Revocation)

12. Respondents' application is subject to denial under section 480, subdivision (a), subparagraph (3) in that respondent Ganjian committed acts that if done by a licentiate of the business or profession in question, would be grounds for suspension or revocation of license. Complainant refers to and by this reference incorporates the allegations set forth above in paragraph 8, inclusive, as though set forth fully.

DISCIPLINE CONSIDERATIONS

13. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on respondents, Complainant alleges that on or about October 13, 1999, a prior disciplinary action entitled *In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against Faramarz Ganjian* before the California State Board of Pharmacy, Case No. 2227, was filed against respondent Faramarz Ganjian. Discipline was imposed for the acts discussed in paragraphs 8 and 9 above. Complainant refers to and by this reference incorporates the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 8 and 9, inclusive, as though set forth fully.

.	Dimensional designation and the second of th		
$1 \mid$	Pursuant to a stipulated settlement, respondent Ganjian's application for pharmacist		
2	licensure examination was granted. Upon successful completion of the California pharmacist		
3	licensure examination and all other licensing requirements, a license was issued to respondent		
4	Ganjian. The license was immediately revoked, the order of revocation stayed and respondent		
5	Ganjian was placed on probation for three (3) years, from January 21, 2005, to January 20, 2008,		
6	on terms and conditions. That decision is now final and is incorporated by reference as if fully se		
7	forth.		
8	<u>PRAYER</u>		
9	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,		
10	and that following the hearing, the California State Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:		
11	1. Denying the application of Specialty Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Faramarz Ganjian, aka		
12	Fred Ganjian; Christopher Michael Hall for an Applicant for Pharmacy Permit;		
13	2. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.		
14	2/4/11		
15	DATED: 3/4/11 VIRGINIA R HEROLD		
16	Executive Officer California State Board of Pharmacy		
17	State of California Complainant		
18			
19	LA2011600073 60615069.doc		
20	·		
21			
22			
23	·		
24			
25			
26			
2.7			
28			
- 1	1		