	i I	
1	KAMALA D. HARRIS	
2	Attorney General of California KAREN B. CHAPPELLE	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General ANTONIO LOPEZ, JR.	
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 206387	
.5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013	
6	Telephone: (213) 897-2536 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804	
7	Attorneys for Complainant	
_	DEVICE	
8 :	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10		1
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 3820
12	YAMINA GISSEL TERRAZAS	DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER
13	1771 Cresthaven Way Pomona, CA 91766	[Gov. Code, §11520]
14		
15	Pharmacy Technician Reg. No. TCH 83775	
16	Respondent.	
17		
18	<u>FINDINGS OF FACT</u>	
19 ⁻	1. On or about March 10, 2011, Complainant Virginia K. Herold, in her official capacit	
20	as the Executive Officer of the California State Board of Pharmacy, filed Accusation No. 3820	
21	against Yamina Gissel Terrazas (Respondent) before the Board. (Accusation attached as Exhibit	
22	A.)	
23	2. On or about June 3, 2009, the Board	issued Pharmacy Technician Registration No.
24	TCH 83775 to Respondent. The Pharmacy Technician Registration was in full force and effect a	
25	all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 3280 and will expire on March 31,	
26		
27	2011, unless renewed.	
	3. On or about March 28, 2011, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Accusation No. 3820, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request	
28	iviali copies of the Accusation No. 3820, Stateme	ent to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request

for Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4100, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board of Pharmacy, which was and is:

1771 Cresthaven Way Pomona, CA 91766.

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions Code section 124.
 - 5. 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, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.
- 6. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of the Accusation, and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 3820.
 - 7. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
 - (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or 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.
- 8. 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 relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this matter, as well as taking official notice of all the investigatory reports, exhibits and statements contained therein on file at the Board's offices regarding the allegations contained in Accusation No. 3820, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 3820, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.

8

11

21

28

Attachment: Exhibit A: Accusation

3

Exhibit A

Accusation

1	KAMALA D. HARRIS		
2	Attorney General of California KAREN B. CHAPPELLE Supervising Deputy Attorney General ANTONIO LOPEZ, JR. Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 206387		
3			
4			
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702		
6	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2536 Facinita: (213) 897-2804		
	Facsimile: (213) 897-2804		
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. 3820		
12	YAMINA GISSEL TERRAZAS		
13	1771 Cresthaven Way Pomona, CA 91766 ACCUSATION		
14			
15	Pharmacy Technician No. TCH 83775		
16	Respondent.		
17			
18	Complainant alleges:		
19	PARTIES		
20	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity		
21	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.		
22	· 2. On or about June 3, 2009, the Board of Pharmacy (Board) issued Pharmacy		
23	Technician No. TCH 83775 to Yamina Gissel Terrazas (Respondent). The Pharmacy Technician		
24	was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on		
25	March 31, 2011, unless renewed.		
26	JURISDICTION		
27	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board, under the authority of the following		
28	laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated		
-: -	1		

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 4. Section 118, subdivision (b), provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration of a license shall not deprive the Board jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.
 - 5. Section 490 states:
- "(a) In addition to any other action that a board is permitted to take against a licensee, a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.
- "(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a board may exercise any authority to discipline a licensee for conviction of a crime that is independent of the authority granted under subdivision (a) only if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the licensee's license was issued.
- "(c) A conviction within the meaning of this section means a plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action that a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken 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 the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code."
 - 6. Section 4300 states that "[e]very license issued may be suspended or revoked."
 - 7. 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:

"(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 a licensee or otherwise, and whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not."

1.

13.

 "(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."

"(k) The conviction of more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any dangerous drug or alcoholic beverage, or any combination of those substances."

"(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 of Title 21 of the United States Code regulating controlled substances or 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."

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

8. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, states, in pertinent part:

"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

9. Section 125.3 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

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 .

20

21 22

23

24

25

2627

28

act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Convictions of Substantially-Related Crimes)

- 10. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 490, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, and section 4301, subdivisions (k) and (l), in that Respondent was convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a pharmacy technician. Either one of the convictions is an independent reason for disciplinary action.
- On or about June 21, 2010, after pleading nolo contendere, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) [driving while having 0.08% and more, by weight, of alcohol in her blood]; one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 14601.2 [driving when privilege suspended or revoked for driving under the influence of alcohol]; and one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 23578 [excessive blood alcohol or refusal to take chemical testing; enhanced penalties], in the criminal proceeding The People of the State of California v. Yamina Gissel Terrazas (Super. Ct. Los Angeles County, 2010, No. OPK02789). The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about April 22, 2010, a Pomona Police Officer was dispatched to investigate a noninjury traffic collision. The officer arrived and noticed a female sitting in the vehicle that was identified as the vehicle that had been in the traffic collision. The officer also noticed that the vehicle had collision damage to the front of the vehicle. The female sitting in the driver's seat of that vehicle was later identified as the Respondent. The officer immediately smelled a strong odor of alcohol emitting from Respondent's breath when asked to step out of the vehicle. Respondent admitted to drinking one beer prior to the collision. Respondent agreed to submit to a series of Field Sobriety Tests and performed poorly. Respondent was subsequently given two alcohol breath tests, with results of .19% BAC and .18% BAC. Respondent was convicted of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) [driving while having 0.08% and more, by weight, of alcohol in her blood]; Vehicle Code section 14601.2 [driving when privilege

6

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

2425

26

27

28

suspended or revoked for driving under the influence of alcohol]; and Vehicle Code section 23578 [excessive blood alcohol or refusal to take chemical testing: enhanced penalties.]

On or about March 10, 2010, after pleading Guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) [driving while having 0.08% and more, by weight, of alcohol in her blood], in the criminal proceeding The People of the State of California v. Yamina Gissel Terrazas (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2010, No. TCH1000039). The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about November 14, 2009, a Chino Police Officer was on patrol and during a routine traffic stop, pulled Respondent over for quickly changing lanes without signaling. The officer also noticed that Respondent's vehicle stopped at the next traffic light and remained stop at a green light for approximately fifteen seconds. The officer immediately detected an odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from the interior of the vehicle. Respondent was observed to have watery eyes, slurred speech, and a strong odor of an alcoholic beverage on her person. Respondent admitted to drinking half of a bottle of wine. During a search, the officer recovered a plastic baggie in Respondent's pants pocket containing the drug LSD. Respondent agreed to a series of Standardized Field Sobriety Tests and performed poorly. Respondent was subsequently given two alcohol breath tests, with results of .170% BAC and .174% BAC. Respondent was convicted of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) [driving while having 0.08% and more, by weight, of alcohol in her blood.]

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Dangerous Use of Alcohol)

11. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (h), in that Respondent used an alcoholic beverage in a dangerous manner while driving a vehicle and being convicted of crimes. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth above in paragraph 10, subparagraphs (a) and (b), as though set forth fully.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Convictions Involving the Consumption of Alcohol)

12. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (k), in

that Respondent was convicted of crimes involving the consumption of alcohol. Complainant

5