BEFORE THE
BOARD OF PHARMACY
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: **LDWPC INC., DBA GARFIELD PRESCRIPTION PHARMACY** 9400 Brighton Way Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 46072 And **PETER FRANZ DOLEZAL** 6722 Capps Avenue Reseda, CA 91335 Pharmacist License No. RPH 33437 Respondents.	Case No. 5337 OAH No. 2016050584 **AS TO RESPONDENT PETER FRANZ DOLEZAL ONLY**

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby adopted by the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs, as its Decision in this matter.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on March 16, 2017.

It is so ORDERED on February 14, 2017.

BOARD OF PHARMACY
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By _____
Amy Gutierrez, Pharm.D.
Board President

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
THOMAS L. RINALDI
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
SUSAN MELTON WILSON
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 106902
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 897-4942
Facsimile: (213) 897-2804
Attorneys for Complainant

BEFORE THE
BOARD OF PHARMACY
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: **LDWPC INC., DBA GARFIELD PRESCRIPTION PHARMACY** 9400 Brighton Way Beverly Hills, CA 90210 Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 46072 **AND** **PETER FRANZ DOLEZAL** 6722 Capps Avenue Reseda, CA 91335 Pharmacist License No. RPH 33437 Respondents.	Case No. 5337 OAH No. 2016050584 **STIPULATED SURRENDER OF LICENSE AND ORDER** [AS TO RESPONDENT PETER FRANZ DOLEZAL ONLY]

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties to the above-entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:

PARTIES

1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) is the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy (Board). She brought this action solely in her official capacity and is represented in this matter by Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General of the State of California, by Susan Melton Wilson, Deputy Attorney General.

///

2. Peter Franz Dolezal (Respondent) is representing himself in this proceeding and has chosen not to exercise his right to be represented by counsel.

3. On or about October 9, 1979, the Board issued Pharmacist License No. RPH 33437 to Peter Franz Dolezal (Respondent). The Pharmacist License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 5337 and will expire on January 31, 2018 unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. 5337 was filed before the (Board),, and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on April 14, 2015. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. 5337 is attached as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

5. Respondent has carefully read, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 5337. Respondent also has carefully read, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order.

6. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to be represented by counsel, at his own expense; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.

7. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

///

///

///

CULPABILITY

8. Respondent admits the truth of each and every charge and allegation in Accusation No. 5337, agrees that cause exists for discipline and hereby surrenders his Pharmacist License No. RPH 33437 for the Board's formal acceptance.

9. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation he enables the Board to issue an order accepting the surrender of his Pharmacist License without further process.

CONTINGENCY

10. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Board. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Board may communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation and surrender, without notice to or participation by Respondent. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that he may not withdraw his agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Board considers and acts upon it. If the Board fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Surrender and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Board shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.

11. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order, including Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.

12. This Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is intended by the parties to be an integrated writing representing the complete, final, and exclusive embodiment of their agreement. It supersedes any and all prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, discussions, negotiations, and commitments (written or oral). This Stipulated Surrender of License and Order may not be altered, amended, modified, supplemented, or otherwise changed except by a writing executed by an authorized representative of each of the parties.

13. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Order:

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Pharmacist License No. RPH 33437, issued to Respondent Peter Franz Dolezal, is surrendered and accepted by the Board of Pharmacy.

1. The surrender of Respondent's Pharmacist License and the acceptance of the surrendered license by the Board shall constitute the imposition of discipline against Respondent. This stipulation constitutes a record of the discipline and shall become a part of Respondent's license history with the Board of Pharmacy.

2. Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as a pharmacist in California as of the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.

3. Respondent shall cause to be delivered to the Board his pocket license and, if one was issued, his wall certificate on or before the effective date of the Decision and Order.

4. If Respondent ever files an application for licensure or a petition for reinstatement in the State of California, the Board shall treat it as a petition for reinstatement. Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations and procedures for reinstatement of a revoked license in effect at the time the petition is filed, and all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 5337 shall be deemed to be true, correct and admitted by Respondent when the Board determines whether to grant or deny the petition.

5. Respondent shall pay the agency its costs of investigation and enforcement in the amount of $9,650.00 prior to issuance of a new or reinstated license.

6. If Respondent should ever apply or reapply for a new license or certification, or petition for reinstatement of a license, by any other health care licensing agency in the State of California, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation, No. 5337 shall be deemed to be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any other proceeding seeking to deny or restrict licensure.

///

///

///

///

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the Stipulated Surrender of License and Order. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Pharmacist License. I enter into this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Board of Pharmacy.

DATED: 12/20/16

PETER FRANZ DOLEZAL
Respondent

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Board of Pharmacy of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Dated: 12/20/16

Respectfully submitted,

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
THOMAS L. RINALDI
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

SUSAN MELTON WILSON
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Complainant

SD2014708186
52329518.doc

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 5337

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
GREGORY J. SALUTE
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
DESIREE I. KELLOGG
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 126461
110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101
P.O. Box 85266
San Diego, CA 92186-5266
Telephone: (619) 645-2996
Facsimile: (619) 645-2061
Attorneys for Complainant

BEFORE THE
BOARD OF PHARMACY
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: **LDWPC INC., DBA GARFIELD PRESCRIPTION PHARMACY** **9400 Brighton Way** **Beverly Hills, CA 90210** **Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 46072** **PETER FRANZ DOLEZAL** **6722 Capps Avenue** **Reseda, CA 91335** **Pharmacist Permit No. RPH 33437** Respondents.	Case No. 5337 **ACCUSATION**

Complainant alleges:

PARTIES

1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.

2. On or about February 20, 2003, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Permit Number PHY 46072 to LDWPC Inc., doing business as Garfield Prescription Pharmacy (Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy). The Pharmacy Permit was in full force and effect

at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on February 1, 2016, unless renewed.

3. On or about October 9, 1979, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacist License Number RPH 33437 to Peter Franz Dolezal (Respondent Peter Dolezal). The Pharmacist License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on January 31, 2016, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

4. This 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 4301 of the Code 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:
>
> ...
>
> (d) The clearly excessive furnishing of controlled substances in violation of subdivision (a) of Section 11153 of the Health and Safety Code.
>
> ...

(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....

...

(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.

...

9. Section 4113(c) of the Code 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.

10. Section 4306.5 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

Unprofessional conduct for a pharmacist may include any of the following:

Acts or omissions that involve, in whole or in part, the inappropriate exercise of his or her education, training, or experience as a pharmacist, whether or not the act or omission arises in the course of the practice of pharmacy or the ownership, management, administration, or operation of a pharmacy or other entity licensed by the board.

Acts or omissions that involve, in whole or in part, the failure to consult appropriate patient, prescription, and other records pertaining to the performance of any pharmacy function.

...

11. Health and Safety Code section 11153(a) states:

A prescription for a controlled substance shall only be issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner acting in the usual course of his or her professional practice. The responsibility for the proper prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances is upon the prescribing practitioner, but a corresponding responsibility rests with the pharmacist who fills the prescription. Except as authorized by this division, the following are not legal prescriptions: (1) an order purporting to be a prescription which is issued not in the usual course of professional treatment or in legitimate and authorized research; or (2) an order for an addict or habitual user of controlled substances, which is issued not in the course of professional treatment or as part of an authorized narcotic treatment program, for the purpose of providing the user with controlled substances, sufficient to keep him or her comfortable by maintaining customary use.

....

12. Section 1707.3 of title 16, California Code of Regulations 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.

13. Section 1716 of title 16, California Code of Regulations states:

Pharmacists shall not deviate from the requirements of a prescription except upon the prior consent of the prescriber or to select 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.

14. Section 1761 of title 16, California Code of Regulations states:

(a) 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.

(b) Even after conferring with the prescriber, a pharmacist shall not compound or dispense a controlled substance prescription where the pharmacist knows or has objective reason to know that said prescription was not issued for a legitimate medical purpose.

COST RECOVERY

15. 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.

DRUGS

16. Hycodan is the brand name for hydrocodone, bitartrate and homatropin, a Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11056 and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.

17. Lortab is the brand name for hydrocodone/APAP, a Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11056 and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.

18. Norco is the brand name for hydrocodone/acetaminophen, a Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11056(e)(5) and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.

19. Phenergan with Codeine is the brand name for promethazine with codeine, a Schedule V controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11058(c)(1) and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.

20. Soma is the brand name for carisoprodol, a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to 21 California Federal Regulations section 1308.14 and is a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.

21. Xanax is the brand name for alprazolam, a Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11057(d)(1) and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

22. From February 20, 2003 through the present, Respondent Peter Dolezal was the Pharmacist-in-Charge of Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy and the only pharmacist on duty at Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy.

23. From November 1, 2009 through December 12, 2012, Respondents dispensed prescriptions for controlled substances written in an identical fashion, for multiple patients at the same time on the same day, sequentially, with individuals other than the patients picking up those prescriptions. Respondents filled many early refills for controlled substances, including Prescription number 280843 dispensed four days after Prescription number 280786 on October 11, 2012 and Prescription number 263568 dispensed three times on December 6, 2010. Prescriptions for controlled substances were also filled multiple times on the same day for the same patient. Prescriptions for alprazolam and promethazine with codeine dispensed by Respondents exceeded the daily maximums recommended to be prescribed for those drugs.

24. Additionally, Respondents dispensed prescriptions which duplicated drug therapies. Respondents also dispensed prescriptions for promethazine with codeine without dispensing a corresponding prescription for an antibiotic. Patients paid for the controlled substance prescriptions in cash at Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy and did not seek reimbursement from an insurance company or government agency. Respondents did not review CURES reports before dispensing controlled substances or otherwise have access to that database.

25. Respondents filled prescriptions for controlled substances for patients who lived a considerable distance from Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy and/or the provider. For example, on October 12 and October 15, 2012, Respondents filled at least eighteen prescriptions for promethazine with codeine from Dr. P.V. and Physician Assistant M.C. who were an average of 15 miles away from those prescribers' offices. Two of those patients lived over forty five miles away from Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy.

26. Respondents dispensed forged prescriptions. On September 9, 2011, Respondents dispensed prescriptions for controlled substances allegedly prescribed by Dr. K.S. but were in fact, not prescribed by him. These prescriptions were also not written on secured paper. No patient addresses were listed on the forged prescriptions.

27. From 2010 through 2012, Respondents' highest volume of dispensed drug was a frequently abused drug, promethazine with codeine.

28. Respondents Garfield Prescription Pharmacy and Peter Dolezal placed orders for suspiciously large amounts of controlled substances with their drug wholesalers.

29. Respondents Garfield Prescription Pharmacy and Peter Dolezal did not follow proper procedures for verifying if a prescription for a controlled substance was written for a legitimate medical purpose in that they dispensed prescriptions to patients who had lost their wallets or social security cards and had been victims of identity theft. If Respondents had attempted to contact the alleged patients, they would have determined that the prescriptions were not dispensed to the victims of identity fraud.

30. Many of the prescriptions dispensed by Respondents were written by Dr. N.A. On October 5, 2011, Dr. N.A. was convicted upon his plea of guilty to the crimes of conspiracy to distribute oxycodone, hydromorphone, hydrocodone, alprazolam and promethazine with codeine in violation of sections 21 United States Code sections 841 (a)(1), (b)(1)(E), (b)(1)(C), (b)(2), (b)(1)(C) and 846 and 18 United States Code section 2(b) in *United States v. N.A.*, Case Number CR 10-01260-SJO, United States District Court for the Central District of California. He was also disciplined by the Medical Board of California for that conviction.

31. Other prescriptions dispensed by Respondents were written by Dr. A.S. In April 2007,

Dr. A.S. was disciplined by the Medical Board of California for gross negligence, repeated negligent acts, incompetence, dishonesty, and prescribing without medical indication or performing a good faith physical examination, among other violations of the Medical Practice Act. In March 2010, he was disciplined again for dishonesty and failing to comply with the term and condition of his probation requiring him to maintain a drug log for all controlled substances ordered, prescribed, dispensed, administered or possessed by Dr. A.S. On or about August 14, 2014, Dr. A.S. was found guilty of fourteen counts of violating title 21 United States Code section 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(E), (b)(2) and (b)(3), distribution of hydrocodone, alprazolam, carisoprodol, diazepam and promethazine with codeine and three counts of violating title 18 United States Code section 1956(A)(1), (B) (i), money laundering, in *United States v. A.S.*, Case Number CR-14-157-R, United States District Court for the Central District of California.

32. Other prescriptions dispensed by Respondents were written by Dr. E.S. On or about February 6, 2014, in *The People of the State of California v. E.S.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. SA081626, Dr. E.S. was convicted of violating Health & Safety Code section 11153(a), issuing a prescription for a controlled substance for a non-legitimate medical purpose. On or about May 31, 2013, Dr. E.S. was disciplined by the Medical Board of California for that conviction and other violations of the Medical Practice Act.

33. Other prescriptions dispensed by Respondents were written by Dr. B.G. Effective October 21, 2010, Dr. B.G. was disciplined by the Medical Board of California for illegally using controlled substances, cocaine and methamphetamine. Effective August 29, 2012, Dr. B.G. was also disciplined by the Medical Board of California for violations of the Medical Practice Act, including excessive prescribing, dishonesty, false representations and failure to maintain adequate and accurate records for participating in a scheme to sell prescriptions to drug users without medical justification.

34. On November 1, 2012, a Board inspector discussed the obligations of pharmacists when dispensing controlled substances with Respondent Peter Dolezal. Despite the discussion of pharmacists' obligations when dispensing controlled substances, Respondents continued to dispense multiple controlled substances without verifying if all prescriptions were written for a

legitimate medical purposes. For example, prescriptions for hydrocodone 10mg/APAP 325 mg, alprazolam 2mg and promethazine with codeine were dispensed to the same patient, CJW on November 16, 2012 and those same prescriptions were dispensed to JI on November 29, 2012. Other examples include the dispensing of full bottles of promethazine with codeine were dispensed in November 2012, including 8 patients on November 26, 2012 and 8 patients on November 27, 2012.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failing to Comply with Corresponding Responsibility for Legitimate Controlled Substance Prescriptions against Respondents)

35. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(j), for violating Health and Safety Code section 11153(a), in that they failed to comply with their corresponding responsibility to ensure that controlled substances were dispensed for a legitimate medical purpose when Respondents furnished prescriptions for controlled substances even though "red flags" were present, indicating those prescriptions were not issued for a legitimate medical purpose, as set forth in paragraphs 22 through 34 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Clearly Excessive Furnishing of Controlled Substances against Respondents)

36. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(d), for the clearly excessive furnishing of controlled substances in violation of subdivision (a) of Section 11153 of the Health and Safety Code, as set forth in paragraphs 22 through 34 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Dispensing Controlled Substance Prescriptions with Significant Errors, Omissions, Irregularities, Uncertainties, Ambiguities or Alterations against Respondents)

37. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for violating title 16, California Code of Regulations, sections 1761(a) and (b) in that they dispensed prescriptions for controlled substances, which contained significant errors, omissions,

irregularities, uncertainties, ambiguities or alterations, as set forth in paragraphs 22 through 34 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Review Patients' Medication Record Before Prescription Drugs Delivered against Respondents)

38. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for violating title 16, California Code of Regulations, section 1707.3, in that they dispensed prescriptions for drugs, without review of patients' medication records before each prescription drug was delivered. Such a review would have revealed numerous "red flags," as set forth in paragraphs 22 through 34 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Exercise or Implement Best Professional Judgment or Corresponding Responsibility when Dispensing Controlled Substances against Respondent Peter Dolezal)

39. Respondent Peter Dolezal is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(o), for violating Business and Professions Code section 4306.5(a) and (b), in that they failed to exercise or implement his best professional judgment or corresponding responsibility when dispensing controlled substances, as set forth in paragraphs 22 through 34 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct against Respondents)

40. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301 for unprofessional conduct in that they engaged in the activities described in paragraphs 22 through 34 above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

41. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondents, Complainant alleges:

a. On March 12, 2012, the Board issued Citation number CI 2011 49865 against Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy for violating Business and Professions Code section 4126.5(a)(4) for improperly furnishing drugs to a wholesaler and 4059.5(a) for selling dangerous drugs to an entity but indicating on the shipping label that it was sold by another entity. The Board issued a fine which Respondent paid.

b. On March 12, 2012, the Board issued Citation number CI 2011 51652 against Respondent Peter Dolezal for violating Business and Professions Code section 4126.5(a)(4) for improperly furnishing drugs to a wholesaler and 4059.5(a) for selling dangerous drugs to an entity but indicating on the shipping label that it was sold by another entity. The Board issued a Citation and Fine and Order of Abatement, which was complied with by Respondent's submission of proof of enrollment in a pre-approved ethics course.

c. Effective April 27, 2001, the Board adopted the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order against Respondent Peter Dolezal and Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy's predecessor in Case No. 2128, OAH No. L-200050072. Respondent Peter Dolezal was placed on probation for three years and the original pharmacy permit issued to Respondent Garfield Prescription Pharmacy's predecessor was voluntarily surrendered for, violating drug laws and regulations, including Health & Safety Code section 11153(a).

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:

1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Permit Number PHY 46072, issued to LDWPC Inc. doing business as Garfield Prescription Pharmacy;

2. Revoking or suspending Pharmacist License Number RPH 33437, issued to Peter Franz Dolezal;

3. Ordering LDWPC Inc. doing business as Garfield Prescription Pharmacy and Peter Franz Dolezal to pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;

4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: 3/31/15

VIRGINIA HEROLD
Executive Officer
Board of Pharmacy
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

SD2014708186
71001759.doc