1		
2		•
3	• .	
4		
5	DEEO	מוצידי מוכ
6	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 3220
9	in the istance of the recusation riganist.	OAH No. L-2009061411
10	EARL GLEN WOOD	DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER
11	736 E. San Francisco Avenue Pomona, CA 91767	
12	Pharmacy Technician License No. TCH 6721	[Gov. Code, §11520]
13		
14	Respondent.	
15		
16 17	EDIDDIO	
18	FINDINGS OF FACT	
19		nant Virginia Herold, in her official capacity as
20	the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, filed	
21	Accusation No. 3220 against Earl Glen Wood (Respondent) before the Board.	
22	2. On or about April 13, 1993, the Board issued Pharmacy Technician License No. TCF	
23	6721 to Respondent. The Pharmacy Technician License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on April 30, 2011, unless renewed.	
24		
25	3. On or about June 22, 2009, Carolina Lopez-Castillo, an employee of the Department of Justice, served by Certified and First Class Mail a copy of the Accusation No. 3220, Statemen	
26	to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and a copy of Government Code	
27	sections 11507.5, 11507.6 and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which	
28	was and is: 736 E. San Francisco Avenue, Pomona, CA 91767.	

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
- 5. On or about June 24, 2009, Respondent signed and returned a Notice of Defense, requesting a hearing in this matter.
- 6. On or about July 20, 2009, Respondent was served, by Certified and First Class Mail, a Supplemental Statement, First Amended Accusation, Request for Discovery, copy of Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6 and 11507.7, and a copy of the Board's Disciplinary Guidelines.

A copy of the First Amended Accusation is attached as exhibit A, and is incorporated herein by reference.

- 7. On or about July 20, 2009, a Notice of Hearing was served by mail at Respondent's address of record and it informed him that an administrative hearing in this matter was scheduled for November 10, 2009. Respondent failed to appear at that hearing.
 - 8. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
 - (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense
 - 9. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
 - (a) If the respondent . . . fails . . . to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.
- 10. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the evidence on file herein, finds that the allegations in First Amended Accusation No. 3220 are true.
- 11. The total cost for investigation and enforcement in connection with the First Amended Accusation are \$10,393.50 as of November 10, 2009.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Earl Glen Wood has subjected his Pharmacy Technician License No. TCH 6721 to discipline.
 - 2. A copy of the First Amended Accusation is attached.

Exhibit A
First Amended Accusation No. 3220

1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Attorney General	
2	of the State of California KAREN B. CHAPPELLE	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General RENE JUDKIEWICZ, State Bar No. 141773	
4	Deputy Attorney General 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702	
5	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2537	
6	Facsimile: (213) 897-2804	
7	Attorneys for Complainant	
8	BEFORE THE	
9	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	STATE OF CAL	IFORNIA
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 3220
12	EARL GLEN WOOD 736 E. San Francisco Avenue	FIRST AMENDED ACCUSATION
13	Pomona, CA 91767	PROT AMERIDED ACCORDION
14	Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 6721	
15	Respondent.	
16	·	·
17	Complainant alleges:	•
18	PARTIES	
19	1. Virginia K. Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her	
20	official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy.	
21	2. On or about April 13, 1993, the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department	
22	of Consumer Affairs, issued Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 6721 to Earl Glen	
23	Wood (Respondent). The Pharmacy Technician Registration was in full force and effect at all	
24	times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on April 30, 2011, unless renewed.	
25	JURISDICTION	
26	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board, under the authority of the	
27	following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise	
28	indicated.	

 H_{i}

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 4. Section 118, subdivision (b), provides that the suspension, expiration, surrender or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.
- 5. Section 490 provides that a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.

6. Section 492 states:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, successful completion of any diversion program under the Penal Code, or successful completion of an alcohol and drug problem assessment program under Article 5 (commencing with Section 23249.50) of Chapter 12 of Division 11 of the Vehicle Code, shall not prohibit any agency established under Division 2 (commencing with Section 500) of this code, or any initiative act referred to in that division, from taking disciplinary action against a licensee or from denying a license for professional misconduct, notwithstanding that evidence of that misconduct may be recorded in a record pertaining to an arrest."

- 7. Section 4060 states, in pertinent part, that "[n]o person shall possess any controlled substance, except that furnished to a person upon the prescription of a physician"
- 8. Section 4300, subdivision (a), states that "[e] very license issued may be suspended or revoked."
 - 9. 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 procured by fraud or misrepresentation or issued by mistake. Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

. . . .

5

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24

2526

27

28

"(h) The administering to oneself, of any controlled substance, or the use of any dangerous drug or of alcoholic beverages to the extent or in a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to oneself, to a person holding a license under this chapter, or to any other person or to the public, or to the extent that the use impairs the ability of the person to conduct with safety to the public the practice authorized by the license.

"(j) The violation of any of the statutes of this state, or any other state, or of the United States regulating controlled substances and dangerous drugs.

The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications,

. . . .

"(1)

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 . . . 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 dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment..."

///

- 717

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

10. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770 states:

"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."

COST RECOVERY

11. Section 125.3, subdivision (d), states:

"The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested pursuant to subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to costs shall not be reviewable by the board to increase the cost award. The board may reduce or eliminate the cost award, or remand to the administrative law judge if the proposed decision fails to make a finding on costs requested pursuant to subdivision (a)."

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES / DANGEROUS DRUGS

- 12. Amphetamine is a Scheduled II controlled substance as defined in Health and Safety Code section 11055, subdivision (d)(1) and a dangerous drug within the meaning of section 4022.
- 13. Marijuana is a hallucinogenic Schedule I controlled substance as defined in Health and Safety Code section 11054, subdivision (d)(13) and a dangerous drug within the meaning of section 4022.
- 14. Methamphetamine is a Schedule II controlled substance as defined by Health and Safety Code section 11055, subdivision (d)(2), and a dangerous drug within the meaning of section 4022.

27 | ///

28 ///

Q

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Convictions of Substantially Related Crime)

- subdivision (I), on the ground of unprofessional conduct, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, in that Respondent was convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee which to a substantial degree evidences his present or potential unfitness to perform the functions authorized by his license in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare. The circumstances of the convictions are as follows:
- a. On or about July 5, 2007, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Health and Safety Code section 11550, subdivision (a) (use/under the influence of a controlled substance, to wit, methamphetamine) in the criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Wood* (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2007, No. MWV701803).
- b. The circumstances underlying the conviction are that on or about January 31, 2007, after an officer of the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department initiated a traffic stop on Respondent, Respondent was found to be under the influence of a controlled substance, and to be in possession of 0.67 grams of methamphetamine. Respondent admitted to law enforcement that he snorted a small amount of the methamphetamine and it affected him.
- c. On or about June 30, 2009, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Health and Safety Code section 11377, subdivision (a) (possession of a controlled substance, to wit, methamphetamine) in the criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Wood* (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2009, No. FWV901515).
- d. The circumstances underlying the conviction are that on or about April 8, 2009, after an officer of the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department initiated a traffic stop on Respondent, Respondent was found to be under the influence of a controlled substance, and to be in possession of methamphetamine.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unlawful Possession of Controlled Substance)

- 16. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (j), on the ground of unprofessional conduct, for violating section 4060, in that Respondent committed acts of professional misconduct when he possessed methamphetamine, a controlled substance and dangerous drug, without a valid prescription, as follows:
- a. On or about April 8, 2009, Respondent possessed a plastic bag containing methamphetamine.
- b. On or about January 31, 2007, Respondent possessed 0.67 grams of methamphetamine; and
- c. On or about August 2, 2005, Montclair police observed Respondent displaying symptoms of being under the influence of a stimulant. He was stopped and found to be in possession of 0.08 grams of methamphetamine

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Dangerous Use of Controlled Substances)

- 17. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (h), on the ground of unprofessional conduct, in that on or about February 26 and 27, 1999, August 2, 2005, January 31, 2007, and April 8, 2009, Respondent committed acts of professional misconduct when he administered to himself or used controlled substances and/or dangerous drugs, to the extent or in a manner to be dangerous or injurious to himself or to any other person or to the public, and his use impairs his ability to conduct with safety to the public the practice authorized by his license. The circumstances are as follows:
- a. On or about February 26, 1999, Respondent snorted a line of a controlled substance and smoked marijuana.
- b. On or about February 27, 1999, Respondent, while driving his vehicle, was under the influence of a controlled substance and in possession of methamphetamine.
- c. On or about August 2, 2005, Respondent placed methamphetamine in his cereal and ate it.

1	d. On or about August 2, 2005, Respondent, while driving his vehicle, was		
2	under the influence of a controlled substance and in possession of methamphetamine.		
3	c. On or about August 2, 2005, Respondent's urine tested positive for		
4	amphetamines.		
5	f. On or about January 31, 2007, Respondent snorted a small amount of		
6	methamphetamine.		
7	g. On or about January 31, 2007, Respondent, while driving his vehicle, was		
8	under the influence of a controlled substance and in possession of methamphetamine.		
9	h. On or about January 31, 2007, Respondent's blood tested positive for		
10	amphetamines.		
11	i. On or about April 8, 2009, after being stopped for a vehicular infraction		
12	and traffic violation, Respondent admitted to the arresting police officer that he snorted a line of		
13	methamphetamine on or about April 7, 2009.		
14	PRAYER		
15	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein		
16	alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board issue a decision:		
17	1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH		
18	6721, issued to Respondent;		
19	2. Ordering Respondent to pay the Board the reasonable costs of the		
20	investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to section 125.3; and		
21	3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.		
22	DATED: 1/14/09		
23			
24	VIRGINAK. HEROLD Executive Officer		
25	Board of Pharmacy State of California		
26	Complainant		
27	LA2008602069 60434799,wpd		
28	2/6/2009dmm		