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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

SOUTHERN MONTEREY COUNTY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, d.b.a. GEORGE L. MEE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, Original Permit No. HSP 43395;

and

GEORGE L. MEE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, Sterile Compounding Permit No. LSC 100083;

and

FREDERICK RONAN RALEIGH,
Pharmacist License No. RPH 27362

Respondents.

Agency Case No. 6226

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval 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 May 26, 2021.

It is so ORDERED on April 26, 2021.

BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Ay n Ligge

By

Greg Lippe Board President

1	XAVIER BECERRA		
2	Attorney General of California CHAR SACHSON		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General LESLIE E. BRAST		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 203296		
5	455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004		
6	Telephone: (415) 510-3373 Facsimile: (415) 703-5480		
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8			
9	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY		
	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11 12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 6226	
	FREDERICK RONAN RALEIGH	STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND	
13	1990 Burnt Rock Way Templeton, CA 93465	DISCIPLINARY ORDER FOR PUBLIC REPROVAL	
14 15	Pharmacist License No. RPH 27362	[Bus. & Prof. Code § 495]	
16	Respondent.		
17			
18	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGR	EED by and between the parties to the above-	
19	entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:		
20	PART		
21	1. Anne Sodergren (Complainant) is the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy		
22	(Board), Department of Consumer Affairs. She brought this action solely in her official capacity		
23	and is represented in this matter by Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of the State of California,		
24	by Leslie E. Brast, Deputy Attorney General.		
25	2. Respondent Frederick Ronan Raleigh (Respondent) is represented in this proceeding		
26	by attorney Jake Reinhardt whose address is 2550 9th Street, Suite 101, Berkeley, California		
27	94710.		
28			
ļ	<u> </u>	1	

JURISDICTION

- 3. On or about August 5, 1971, the Board issued Original Pharmacist License No. RPH 27362 to Respondent. The License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 6226, and will expire on December 31, 2020.
- 4. Accusation No. 6226 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 5, 2018. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. 6226 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 5. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 6226. Respondent has also carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval.
- 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 them; 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. 6226.
- 9. Respondent agrees that his Pharmacist License is subject to discipline and agrees to be bound by the Disciplinary Order below.

3 4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

- 21 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

CONTINGENCY

- 10. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Board of Pharmacy. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and Board staff may communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation and settlement, without notice to or participation by Respondent or his counsel. 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 Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval 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.
- The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval, including PDF and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 12. This Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval 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 Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval may not be altered, amended, modified, supplemented, or otherwise changed except by a writing executed by an authorized representative of each of the parties.
- 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 Disciplinary Order:
- ///
- ///
 - ///
- ///

1	DISCIPLINARY ORDER		
2	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Pharmacist License No. RPH 27362 issued to Responde		
3	Frederick Ronan Raleigh (Respondent) shall be publicly reproved by the Board of Pharmacy		
4	under Business and Professions Code section 495 in resolution of Accusation No. 6226, attache		
5	as Exhibit A.		
6	Cost Recovery. Respondent shall pay \$3,000 to the Board for its costs associated with the		
7	investigation and enforcement of this matter. Respondent shall be permitted to pay these costs		
8	a payment plan approved by the Board. If Respondent fails to pay the Board costs as ordered,		
9	Respondent shall not be allowed to renew his Pharmacist License until he pays costs in full.		
10	<u>ACCEPTANCE</u>		
11	I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public		
12	Reproval and have fully discussed it with my attorney, Jake Reinhardt. I understand the		
13	stipulation and the effect it will have on my Pharmacist License. I enter into this Stipulated		
14	Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently		
15	and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Board of Pharmacy.		
16			
17	DATED:		
18	FREDERICK RONAN RALEIGH Respondent		
19			
20	I have read and fully discussed with my client, Respondent Frederick Ronan Raleigh, the		
21	terms and conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and		
22	Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval. I approve its form and content.		
23			
24	DATED:		
25	JAKE REINHARDT Attorney for Respondent		
26	///		
27	///		
28	///		
	4		

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Pharmacist License No. RPH 27362 issued to Respondent Frederick Ronan Raleigh (Respondent) shall be publicly reproved by the Board of Pharmacy under Business and Professions Code section 495 in resolution of Accusation No. 6226, attached as Exhibit A.

Cost Recovery. Respondent shall pay \$3,000 to the Board for its costs associated with the investigation and enforcement of this matter. Respondent shall be permitted to pay these costs in a payment plan approved by the Board. If Respondent fails to pay the Board costs as ordered, Respondent shall not be allowed to renew his Pharmacist License until he pays costs in full.

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval and have fully discussed it with my attorney, Jake Reinhardt. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have or my Pharmacist License. I enter into this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Board of Pharmacy.

DATED: 2/24/20 Respondent

DATED: 2/24/20 Respondent

DATED: 2/24/20 Respondent

I have read and fully discussed with my client, Respondent Frederick Ronan Raleigh, the terms and conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval. I approve its form and content.

DATED: 2/25/20

JAKE REINHARDT

Auforney for Respondent

27 | /// 28 | ///

///

ENDORSEMENT The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Board of Pharmacy of the Department of Consumer Affairs. DATED: February 9, 2021 Respectfully submitted, XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California CHAR SACHSON Supervising Deputy Attorney General LESLIE E. BRAST Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant SF2017402043

ENDORSEMENT The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order for Public Reproval is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Board of Pharmacy of the Department of Consumer Affairs. DATED: _____ Respectfully submitted, XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California CHAR SACHSON Supervising Deputy Attorney General LESLIE E. BRAST Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant SF2017402043

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 6226

1	XAVIER BECERRA		
2	Attorney General of California CHAR A. SACHSON		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General LESLIE E. BRAST		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 203296		
5	455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004		
6	Telephone: (415) 703-5548 Facsimile: (415) 703-5480		
7	Attorneys for Complainant	***************************************	
8	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY		
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10	T d NEW Old A C A L	C N (00)	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 6226	
12	SOUTHERN MONTEREY COUNTY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, d.b.a. GEORGE L. MEE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL	ACCUSATION	
13	300 Canal Street King City, CA 93930		
14	Original Permit No. HSP 43395		
15	and		
16	GEORGE L. MEE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL		
17	300 Canal Street King City, CA 93930		
18	Sterile Compounding Permit No. LSC 100083		
19	and .		
20	FREDERICK RONAN RALEIGH		
21	808 Vista Cerro Dr. Paso Robles, CA 93446	·.	
22 23	Pharmacist License No. RPH 27362		
24	Respondents.		
25	Complainant alleges:		
26	PARTIES		
27	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity		
28	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs.		
	1		

- 2. On or about February 26, 1998, the Board issued Original Permit Number HSP 43395 to Southern Monterey County Memorial Hospital, d.b.a. George L. Mee Memorial Hospital (Respondent Hospital). The License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on February 1, 2019, unless renewed.
- 3. On or about May 20, 2014, the Board issued Sterile Compounding Permit No. LSC 100083 to Respondent Hospital. The License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein. The License expired on February 1, 2017, and was canceled on canceled on January 24, 2018.
- 4. On or about August 5, 1971, the Board issued Original Pharmacist License No. RPH 27362 to Frederick Rohan Raleigh (Respondent Raleigh). The License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December 31, 2018, unless renewed. Since on or about November 23, 2016, Respondent Raleigh has served and/or has been reflected in Board records as the pharmacist-in-charge (PIC) for Respondent Hospital.

JURISDICTION

- 5. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
- 6. 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.].
- 7. Section 4300(a) of the Code provides that every license issued by the Board may be suspended or revoked.
- 8. Section 4300.1 of the Code provides that the expiration, cancellation, forfeiture, or suspension of a Board-issued license, 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

Business and Professions Code:

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 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 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 by any other state or federal regulatory agency.

. . .

California Code of Regulations:

11. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1735.2(j), states:

Prior to allowing any drug product preparation to be compounded in a pharmacy, the pharmacist-in-charge shall complete a self-assessment for compounding pharmacies developed by the board (Incorporated by reference is "Community Pharmacy & Hospital Outpatient Pharmacy Compounding Self-Assessment" Form 17M-39 Rev. 02/12.) as required by Section 1715 of Title 16, Division 17, of the California Code of Regulations. That form contains a first section applicable to all compounding, and a second section applicable to sterile injectable compounding. The first section must be completed by the pharmacist-in-charge before any compounding is performed in the pharmacy. The second section must be completed by the pharmacist-in-charge before any sterile compounding is performed in the pharmacy. The applicable sections of the self-assessment shall subsequently be completed before July 1 of each odd-numbered year, within 30 days of the start date of a new pharmacist-in-charge or change of location, and within 30 days of

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Perform End Product and Sterility Testing)

- 19. Respondents are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301(o) and/or section 4113(c) of the Code, by reference to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1735.8(c), for directly or indirectly violating, attempting to violate, or assisting in or abetting a violation of laws or regulations governing the practice of pharmacy, in that Respondents failed to enact and implement a quality assurance plan requiring end product testing for potency and sterility. The circumstances are as follows:
- 20. On or about December 20, 2016, during an inspection at Respondent Hospital, the Pharmacy Board's inspector found Respondents had not done end product testing on a compounded product for sterility or potency during the preceding year.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Require Compounding Staff to Demonstrate Knowledge)

- 21. Respondents are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301(o) and/or section 4113(c) of the Code, by reference to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1735.7(c), for directly or indirectly violating, attempting to violate, or assisting in or abetting a violation of laws or regulations governing the practice of pharmacy, in that Respondents failed to require pharmacy personnel to demonstrate knowledge about processes and procedures used in compounding prior to compounding any drug preparation. The circumstances are as follows:
- 22. On or about December 20, 2016, during an inspection at Respondent Hospital, the Pharmacy Board's inspector found Respondents had hired pharmacists and had allowed the new pharmacists to compound without first performing gloved fingertip and media fill tests. Pharmacist in Charge Fred Raleigh compounded sterile injectable products and had not performed an annual gloved fingertip and media fill test.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Perform Annual Review of Compounding Policies and Procedures)

23. Respondents are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301(o) and/or section 4113(c) of the Code, by reference to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section

14

13

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

1735.5(b), for directly or indirectly violating, attempting to violate, or assisting in or abetting a violation of laws or regulations governing the practice of pharmacy, in that Respondents failed to perform, and document on an annual basis, the performance by the pharmacist-in-charge of a review of policies and procedures. The circumstances are as follows:

24. On or about December 20, 2016, during an inspection at Respondent Hospital, the Pharmacy Board's inspector found that the pharmacist-in-charge had not reviewed the compounding policies and procedures during the preceding year.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Lack of Procedure to Advise of Changes to Compounding Policies and Procedures)

- Respondents are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301(o) and/or section 4113(c) of the Code, by reference to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1735.5(c)(1), for directly or indirectly violating, attempting to violate, or assisting in or abetting a violation of laws or regulations governing the practice of pharmacy, in that Respondents failed to have any procedure for notifying staff assigned to compounding duties of any changes in policies or procedures. The circumstances are as follows:
- On or about December 20, 2016, during an inspection at Respondent Hospital, the 26. Pharmacy Board's inspector found that the facility had no policy or procedure stating how staff were to be notified of new or changed compounding policies and procedures.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unlawful Operation)

27. Respondents are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301(o) and/or section 4113(c) of the Code, by reference to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1751.4(a), for directly or indirectly violating, attempting to violate, or assisting in or abetting a violation of laws or regulations governing the practice of pharmacy, in that Respondents allowed and/or engaged in sterile drug preparation and compounding when Respondents knew, or should have known, that the compounding environment failed to meet criteria specified in the pharmacy's written policies and procedures for the safe compounding of sterile drug preparations. The circumstances are as follows:

28. On or about December 20, 2016, during an inspection at Respondent Hospital, the Pharmacy Board's inspector found that the compounding room was a converted patient room with a full bathroom, openable windows, no line of demarcation, and a crowded, disorganized segregated clean room.

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Inadequate Cleaning of Facility)

- 29. Respondents are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301(o) and/or section 4113(c) of the Code, by reference to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1751.4(d), for directly or indirectly violating, attempting to violate, or assisting in or abetting a violation of laws or regulations governing the practice of pharmacy, in that Respondents failed to clean the facility in the manner required by law. The circumstances are as follows:
- 30. On or about December 20, 2016, during an inspection at Respondent Hospital, the Pharmacy Board's inspector found that the compounding room's ceilings, walls, floors, shelves, tables and stools had not been cleaned weekly since the last week in April 2016.

EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Inappropriate Beyond-Use Dates)

- 31. Respondents are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301(o) and/or section 4113(e) of the Code, by reference to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1751.7(a)(4), for directly or indirectly violating, attempting to violate, or assisting in or abetting a violation of laws or regulations governing the practice of pharmacy, in that Respondents utilized inappropriate beyond use dates for compounded sterile drug preparations. The circumstances are as follows:
- 32. On or about December 20, 2016, during an inspection at Respondent Hospital, the Pharmacy Board's inspector found that the facility should have a beyond-use date of no more than an hour, or immediate use. Beyond use dates assigned to sterile injectable drugs were: 12 hour, 24 hours, and longer per compounding records and master formulas.

27 | | ///

28 || / /

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 Original Permit Number HSP 43395, issued to Southern Monterey County Memorial Hospital, d.b.a. George L. Mee Memorial Hospital;
- 2. Revoking or suspending Sterile Compounding Permit No. LSC 100083, issued to George L. Mee Memorial Hospital;
- 3. Revoking or suspending Original Pharmacist License No. RPH 27362, issued to Frederick Rohan Raleigh;
- 4. Ordering Respondents 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; and,
 - 5. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: 4/5/18

VIRGINIA HEROLD Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California Complainant