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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

QUALITY SPECIALTY PHARMACY, INC., DBA QUALITY SPECIALTY PHARMACY

Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 50710;

and

VLADISLAV TENENBAUM

Pharmacist License No. RPH 68507,

Respondents

Agency Case No. 6444

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Surrender of License 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 26, 2020.

It is so ORDERED on February 25, 2020.

BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Ay n Lippe

Ву

Greg Lippe Board President

1	XAVIER BECERRA		
2	Attorney General of California KENT D. HARRIS Supervising Deputy Attorney General JOSHUA B. EISENBERG Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 279323		
3			
4			
5	1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255		
6 7	Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-6115 Facsimile: (916) 327-8643 Attorneys for Complainant		
8	Attorneys for Complainani		
9	BEFORE THE		
10	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 6444	
12		Case 110. 0444	
13	QUALITY SPECIALTY PHARMACY, INC., DBA QUALITY SPECIALTY	CTINII ATEN CUNDENDED OF	
14	PHARMACY 2233 W. Lomita Blvd.	STIPULATED SURRENDER OF LICENSE AND ORDER	
15	Lomita, CA 90717	(RESPONDENT QUALITY SPECIALTY	
16	Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 50710	PHARMACY, INC., DBA QUALITY SPECIALTY PHARMACY)	
17	and		
18 19	VLADISLAV TENENBAUM 2685 Euclid Heights Blvd., #1 Cleveland Heights, OH 44106		
20	Pharmacist License No. RPH 68507		
21	Respondents.		
22			
23	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties to the above-		
24	entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:		
25	<u>PARTIES</u>		
26	1. Anne Sodergren (Complainant) is the Interim Executive Officer of the Board of		
27	Pharmacy (Board). She brought this action solely in her official capacity and is represented in		
28			
		1	

this matter by Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of the State of California, by Joshua B. Eisenberg, Deputy Attorney General.

- Quality Specialty Pharmacy, Inc., dba Quality Specialty Pharmacy (Respondent) is represented in this proceeding by attorney Herb L. Weinberg, whose address is 1990 S. Bundy Drive, Suite 777, Los Angeles, CA 90025.
- 3. On or about August 17, 2011, the Board issued Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 50710 to Respondent. The Pharmacy Permit was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 6444. Respondent's Pharmacy Permit expired on August 1, 2019, and has not been renewed.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. 6444 was filed before the Board, and is currently pending against the Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on October 7, 2019. Respondent timely filed a Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. 6444 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 5. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 6444. Respondent has also carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order.
- 6. Respondent is fully aware of its legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against it; the right to present evidence and to testify on its 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 understands that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 6444, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon its Pharmacy Permit.
- 9. For the purpose of resolving the Accusation without the expense and uncertainty of further proceedings, Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could establish a factual basis for the charges in the Accusation and that those charges constitute cause for discipline. Respondent hereby gives up its right to contest that cause for discipline exists based on those charges.
- 10. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation, it enables the Board to issue an order accepting the surrender of its Pharmacy Permit without further process.

CONTINGENCY

- 11. 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 or its counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that it may not withdraw its 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.
- 12. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order, including PDF and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 13. 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.

14. 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 Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 50710, issued to Quality Specialty Pharmacy, Inc., dba Quality Specialty Pharmacy is surrendered and accepted by the Board.

- 1. The surrender of Respondent's Pharmacy Permit, and the acceptance of the surrendered permit 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.
- 2. Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as a pharmacy in California as of the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.
- 3. Respondent shall cause to be delivered to the Board its pocket license and, if any was issued, its wall certificate on or before the effective date of the Decision and Order.
- 4. If Respondent ever applies for licensure or petitions for reinstatement in the State of California, the Board shall treat it as a new application for licensure. Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations and procedures for licensure in effect at the time the application or petition is filed, and all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 6444 shall be deemed to be true, correct and admitted by Respondent when the Board determines whether to grant or deny the application or petition.
- 5. Respondent shall pay the agency its costs of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$22,799.75 prior to issuance of a new or reinstated license. Respondents shall be jointly and severally liable for the payment of these costs.
- 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. 6444 shall be deemed to

1	be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any	
2	other proceeding seeking to deny or restrict licensure.	
3	7. Respondent shall not apply for licensure or petition for reinstatement for three (3)	
4	years from the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.	
5	<u>ACCEPTANCE</u>	
6	I have carefully read the above Stipulated Surrender of License and Order and have fully	
7	discussed it with my attorney. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my	
8	Pharmacy Permit. I enter into this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order voluntarily,	
9	knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Board of	
10	Pharmacy.	
11		
12	DATED:	
13	QUALITY SPECIALTY PHARMACY, INC., DBA QUALITY SPECIALTY	
14	PHARMACY Respondent	
15		
16	I have read and fully discussed with Respondents Quality Specialty Pharmacy, Inc., dba	
17	Quality Specialty Pharmacy the terms and conditions and other matters contained in this	
18	Stipulated Surrender of License and Order. I approve its form and content.	
19		
20	DATED: HERB L. WEINBERG	
21	Attorney for Respondent	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	5	

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. Respectfully submitted, XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California KENT D. HARRIS Supervising Deputy Attorney General JOSHUA B. EISENBERG Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant LA2018601364 14193965.docx

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 6444

1	XAVIER BECERRA		
2	Attorney General of California KENT D. HARRIS		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General JOSHUA B. EISENBERG		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 279323		
5	1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255		
6	Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-6115		
7	Facsimile: (916) 327-8643 Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFOR	E THE	
9	BOARD OF PHARMACY		
	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10		ALIFORMA	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 6444	
12	QUALITY SPECIALTY PHARMACY,		
13	INC., DBA QUALITY SPECIALTY PHARMACY	ACCUSATION	
14	2233 W. Lomita Blvd. Lomita, CA 90717		
15	Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 50710,		
16	and		
17	VLADISLAV TENENBAUM		
18	2685 Euclid Heights Blvd., #1 Cleveland Heights, OH 44106		
19	Pharmacist License No. RPH 68507		
20	Respondents.		
21			
22			
23	Complainant alleges:		
24	PAR		
25	1. Anne Sodergren (Complainant) bring	s this Accusation solely in her official capacity	
26	as the Interim Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer		
27	Affairs.		
28	///		
		1	

1	subject to review by the superior court pursuant to Section 1094.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure.	
2		
3	6. Code section 4300.1 states:	
4	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	
5	of a license on a retired status, or the voluntary surrender of a license by a licensee	
6	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.	
7	render a decision suspending of revoking the needse.	
8	STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS	
9	7. Code section 4022 states:	
10	"Dangerous drug" or "dangerous device" means any drug or device unsafe for self-use in humans or animals, and includes the following:	
11	(a) Any drug that bears the legend: "Caution: federal law prohibits dispensing	
12	without prescription," "Rx only," or words of similar import.	
13	(b) Any device that bears the statement: "Caution: federal law restricts this device to sale by or on the order of a," "Rx only," or words of similar	
14	import, the blank to be filled in with $\overline{\text{the designation of the practitioner licensed}}$ to use or order use of the device.	
1516	(c) Any other drug or device that by federal or state law can be lawfully dispensed only on prescription or furnished pursuant to Section 4006.	
17	8. Section 4113 of the Code states in pertinent part, "(c) The pharmacist-in-charge shall	
18	be responsible for a pharmacy's compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations	
19	pertaining to the practice of pharmacy"	
20	9. Code section 4301 states in pertinent part:	
21	The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty of	
22	unprofessional conduct or whose license has been issued by mistake. Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:	
23	(c) Gross negligence.	
24	(d) The clearly excessive furnishing of controlled substances in violation of	
25	subdivision (a) of Section 11153 of the Health and Safety Code.	
26		
27	(j) The violation of any of the statutes of this state, of any other state, or of the United States regulating controlled substances and dangerous drugs.	
28		
	3	

1	(o) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or
2	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
3	or federal regulatory agency.
4	
5	10. Code section 4306.5 states:
6	Unprofessional conduct for a pharmacist may include any of the following:
7	(a) 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
8	the act or omission arises in the course of the practice of pharmacy or the
9	ownership, management, administration, or operation of a pharmacy or other entity licensed by the board.
10	(b) Acts or omissions that involve, in whole or in part, the failure to exercise or
11	implement his or her best professional judgment or corresponding responsibility with regard to the dispensing or furnishing of controlled substances, dangerous
12	drugs, or dangerous devices, or with regard to the provision of services.
13	(c) Acts or omissions that involve, in whole or in part, the failure to consult appropriate patient, prescription, and other records pertaining to the performance
14	of any pharmacy function.
15	(d) Acts or omissions that involve, in whole or in part, the failure to fully maintain and retain appropriate patient-specific information pertaining to the performance of any pharmacy function.
16	of any pharmacy renetion.
17	11. Code section 4307(a) states:
18	Any person who has been denied a license or whose license has been revoked or is
19	under suspension, or who has failed to renew his or her license while it was under suspension, or who has been a manager, administrator, owner member, officer,
20	director, associate, or partner of any partnership, corporation, firm, or association whose application for a license has been denied or revoked, is under suspension or
21	has been placed on probation, and while acting as the manger, administrator, owner, member, officer, director, associate, or partner had knowledge or
22	knowingly participated in any conduct for which the license was denied, revoked, suspended, or placed on probation, shall be prohibited from serving as a manger,
23	administrator, owner, member, officer, director, associate, or partner of a licensee as follows:
24	(1) Where a probationary license is issued or where an existing license is
25	placed on probation, this prohibition shall remain in effect for a period not to exceed five years.
26	(2) Where the license is denied or revoked, the prohibition shall continue
27	until the license is issued or reinstated.
28	

1	(7) (A) Six quantity check off boxes shall be printed on the form so that the prescriber may indicate the quantity by checking the applicable box where the following quantities shall appear:
2	1-24
3	25-49
4	50-74
5	
6	75-100
7	101-150
8	151 and over.
9	(B) In conjunction with the quantity boxes, a space shall be provided to designate the units referenced in the quantity boxes when the drug is not in tablet or capsule form.
10	(8) Prescription blanks shall contain a statement printed on the bottom of
11	the prescription blank that the "Prescription is void if the number of drugs prescribed is not noted."
12	•
13	(9) The preprinted name, category of licensure, license number, federal controlled substance registration number, and address of the prescribing practitioner.
14	(10) Check boxes shall be printed on the form so that the prescriber may
15	indicate the number of refills ordered.
16	(11) The date of origin of the prescription.
17	(12) A check box indicating the prescriber's order not to substitute.
18	
19	(13) An identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice.
20	(14) (A) A check box by the name of each prescriber when a prescription form lists multiple prescribers.
21	
22	(B) Each prescriber who signs the prescription form shall identify himself or herself as the prescriber by checking the box by his or her name.
23	(b) Each batch of controlled substance prescription forms shall have the lot
24	number printed on the form and each form within that batch shall be numbered sequentially beginning with the numeral one.
25	
26	///
27	///
28	111

(e) This section shall become operative on January 1, 2005.

28

COST RECOVERY

17. Section 125.3 of the Code 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 act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

DRUGS

18. Oxycodone, sold under the brand name Roxicodone, is a dangerous drug as defined by Code section 4022 and is a Schedule II controlled substance pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 11055(b)(1)(M). It is used to treat pain.

FACTS

- 19. The Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES) is California's Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP). Pharmacies in California are required to report all filled prescriptions for Schedule II-IV controlled substances to the database every week. The data is collected statewide and can be used by healthcare professionals to evaluate and determine whether their patients are utilizing controlled substances correctly, or if a patient has used multiple prescribers and multiple pharmacies to fill controlled substance prescriptions.
- 20. On August 29, 2017, a Board inspector conducted an inspection of Respondent Pharmacy following the Board's analysis of controlled substance dispensing data as reported to CURES by Respondent Pharmacy. According to the CURES data, the review identified factors of irregularity or red flags consistent with possible illegitimate doctor prescribing and indiscriminate pharmacy dispensing, as follows:
- a. According to the CURES data, 97% of the prescriptions written by Dr. R.C.G. and dispensed by Respondents were for oxycodone 30 mg tablets.
 - b. 92% of the prescriptions were paid for utilizing cash.
- c. Sequential prescription numbers were also noted, indicating: (1) patients may have been coming to the pharmacy in small groups to drop off their controlled substance prescriptions; (2) one patient may have come to the pharmacy to drop off multiple controlled substance

prescriptions; or (3) multiple patients may have trickled into the pharmacy over a period of time, dropped off their controlled substance prescriptions and then the pharmacy typed them one after another.

- 21. The CURES data analysis also revealed that Respondents dispensed several prescriptions for oxycodone 30 mg tablets written by Drs. A.A. and R.M.G. Previous investigations identified Drs. A.A. and R.M.G. as suspect prescribers.
- 22. At the Board inspector's request, the pharmacy staff located prescriptions written by Drs. R.C.G., A.A., and, R.M.G. At the end of the inspection, the Board inspector requested that Respondent Pharmacy's Pharmacist-in-charge provide the electronic pharmacy records of dispensed prescriptions for all patients and all drugs for the date range from 08/01/2013 to 08/29/2017. The Board inspector also requested that the PIC send, by mail, all prescription documents which were not located during the inspection.
- 23. On or about September 8, 2017, the Board inspector received electronic pharmacy dispensing records from Respondent Pharmacy by e-mail. Analysis of these records revealed the following:
- a. Payment method for all medications (controlled and non-controlled) dispensed from 08/01/2013 to 08/29/2017 was approximately 9.7% cash and 90.3% insurance. This is Respondent Pharmacy's baseline measure for the time period analyzed.
- b. The percentage of payment method varied for non-controlled substances and controlled substances. 7.1% of non-controlled substances were paid for with cash while 92.1% were paid for by insurance. 29.1% of controlled substances were paid for with cash while 70.9% were paid for by insurance. The percentage of cash payment for controlled substances was approximately four times that of non-controlled substances and three times Respondent Pharmacy's baseline measure, which is a factor of irregularity.
- 24. A review of Respondents' prescriber profiles for certain prescribers revealed recurring irregularities in the prescribers' prescribing practices that should have caused Respondents to question the legitimacy of the prescriptions issued by these prescribers.

Dr. R.C.G.

- 25. Respondents dispensed 386 prescriptions under the prescribing authority of Dr. R.C.G. from January 15, 2014 through October 19, 2016; 90.2% of the prescriptions were for controlled substances.
- 26. Board Inspector I.T. noted the following factors of irregularity during the review of prescriptions written by Dr. R.C.G. and dispensed by Respondents:
- a. 90.2% of the prescriptions written by Dr. R.C.G. were for a controlled substance. The percentage of controlled vs. non-controlled substance dispensing was not consistent with the pattern of dispensing for Respondent Pharmacy.
- b. Between August 1, 2013 and August 29, 2017, Respondent Pharmacy dispensed 1,507 out of 215,258 total prescriptions (.7%) for the largest strength of the highly abused and addictive opioid, oxycodone 30 mg. 88.3% of the prescriptions written by Dr. R.C.G. and dispensed by Respondents were for oxycodone 30 mg and 98% of the controlled substance prescriptions written by Dr. R.C.G. were for oxycodone 30 mg. This percentage of oxycodone 30 mg dispensing was not consistent with the pattern of dispensing for Respondent Pharmacy. Additionally, 22.6% (341 of 1,507) of the total oxycodone 30 mg prescriptions dispensed by Respondents were written by Dr. R.C.G.
- c. Of all prescriptions written by Dr. R.C.G. and dispensed by Respondents, 94.6% of all prescriptions and 96.3% of controlled substance prescriptions were paid for with cash. The disproportionate use of cash as payment for Dr. R.C.G.'s prescriptions was not consistent with the cash payment for all medications (9.7%) and controlled substances (29.1%) at Respondent Pharmacy. Additionally, Dr. R.C.G.'s patients paid cash for oxycodone 30 mg prescriptions as costly as \$841.50.
- d. Although Dr. R.C.G. reported rheumatology as his primary area of practice and internal medicine as his secondary area of practice, the top medication prescribed by Dr. R.C.G. and dispensed by Respondent Pharmacy was oxycodone 30 mg. Dr. R.C.G.'s area of practice was not stated on his prescription documents, however, prior to dispensing oxycodone 30 mg to a patient, it would be prudent for a pharmacist to determine this information.

- e. Dr. R.C.G. prescribed oxycodone 30 mg for the treatment of pain to 29 out of 30 patients (96.7%) and 16 of the 30 patients (53.5%) received prescriptions exclusively for oxycodone 30 mg to treat their pain.
- f. Dr. R.C.G. prescribed and Respondents dispensed the highest strength oxycodone tablets (30 mg) to 29 of 30 patients. Of Dr. R.C.G.'s 30 patients, 20 were being treated for the identical medical diagnosis of lumbar radiculopathy.
- h. Respondent Pharmacy dispensed the highest strength of oxycodone (30 mg) to at least 15 of 30 new patients whose Patient Activity Reports (PARs) showed that they were potentially opioid naïve¹.
- i. Multiple patients' prescriptions for oxycodone 30 mg were filled by Respondent Pharmacy on the same day and approximately the same time. Those prescriptions were written by Dr. R.C.G. on the same day, had identical lot/serial numbers and/or were either sequential or close in script number. Respondent Pharmacy assigned consecutive or nearly consecutive pharmacy prescription numbers.

Dr. A.A.

- 27. Board Inspector I.T. noted the following factors of irregularity during the review of prescriptions written by Dr. A.A. and dispensed by Respondents:
- a. Of the prescriptions written by Dr. A.A., 59.8% of them were for a controlled substance and 58% of the total prescriptions written by Dr. A.A. were for oxycodone 30 mg.
- b. 100% of the controlled substance prescriptions written by Dr. A.A. were paid for utilizing cash.
- c. The highest strength of oxycodone (30 mg) was dispensed to all 59 of Dr. A.A.'s patients regardless of their age and without evidence of upward titration from a lower dose.
- d. Respondent Pharmacy dispensed the highest strength of oxycodone (30 mg) to at least 22 of 59 new patients whose PARs showed they were potentially opioid naïve.

¹ The US Food and Drug Administration attributes opioid tolerance to patients who are taking, for one week or longer, at least: 60 mg oral morphine/day, 30 mg oral oxycodone/day, 8 mg oral hydromorphone/day, or an equianalgesic dose of any other opioid. Opioid naïve patients are those who do not meet the definition of opioid tolerant, and who have not taken opioid doses at least as much as those listed for one week or longer.

Illegitimate Prescription Documents

28. Respondent Pharmacy dispensed one prescription written by Dr. A.A. for controlled substances which were written on prescription documents containing significant errors and lacking security features as follows:

Dr. A.A. - RX 540740

- a. The prescription document did not contain a watermark on the backside of the prescription document consisting of the words "California Security Prescription." Instead, the watermark printed on the back of the prescription document stated, "DocuGard."
- b. Prescription forms for controlled substances must contain six quantity check off boxes so that the prescriber may indicate the quantity by checking the applicable box where the following quantities shall appear: 1-24, 25-49, 50-74, 75-100, 101-150, and 151 and over. Instead, the prescription document contained six quantity check off boxes with different quantities listed: 1-24, 25-49, 50-74, 75-100, 101-150, Over 151.
- c. The prescription document did not include check boxes so that the prescriber may indicate the number of refills ordered. Instead, the prescription document listed refill numbers to be circled by the prescriber.
- d. The prescription document did not include a lot number that should have been printed on the form.
- 29. Respondent Pharmacy dispensed five prescriptions written by Dr. R.M.G. for controlled substances which were written on prescription documents containing significant errors and lacking security features as follows:

Dr. R.M.G. - RXs 506903, 506906, 507067, 507356, and 507618

a. The above referenced prescription documents lacked a latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the prescription document. If the prescription is scanned or photocopied, the word "void" shall appear in a pattern across the entire front of the prescription document. Instead the prescription documents had the word "Rx INVALID" printed across the front when photocopied.

///

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

AS TO ALL RESPONDENTS

(Failure to Comply with Corresponding Responsibility)

31. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(j) and (o), in conjunction with Health and Safety Code section 11153(a) and Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, section 1761, for unprofessional conduct in that Respondents failed to comply with their corresponding responsibility to ensure that controlled substances are dispensed for a legitimate medical purpose when Respondents dispensed 482 prescriptions under the prescribing authority of Drs. R.C.G. and A.A. when there were objective factors of irregularity that suggested the medical illegitimacy of the prescriptions, as set forth in paragraphs 24-28 and their subparagraphs above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

AS TO ALL RESPONDENTS

(Unprofessional Conduct – Gross Negligence)

32. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4301(c) and (o), in conjunction with Health and Safety Code section 11153(a) and Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, section 1761, for gross negligence in that Respondents failed to comply with their corresponding responsibility to ensure that controlled substances are dispensed for a legitimate medical purpose when Respondent filled 482 prescriptions under the prescribing authority of Drs. R.C.G. and A.A. when there were objective factors of irregularity that suggested the medical illegitimacy of the prescriptions, as set forth in paragraphs 24-28 and their subparagraphs above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

AS TO ALL RESPONDENTS

(Clearly Excessive Furnishing of Controlled Substances)

33. Respondents are subject to disciplinary action for engaging in unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code section 4301(c) for the clearly excessive furnishing of controlled substances, as

set forth in paragraphs 24-28 and their subparagraphs above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

AS TO RESPONDENT TENENBAUM ONLY

(Unprofessional Conduct – Failure to Exercise, or Inappropriate Exercise, of Professional Education, Training, or Experience)

34. Respondent Tenenbaum is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 4306.5, for unprofessional conduct for the inappropriate exercise of his education, training, or experience as a pharmacist when Respondent failed to take steps to determine the legitimacy of prescriptions dispensed between August 1, 2013 and December 2, 2015, in light of objective factors of irregularity, as set forth in paragraphs 24-28 and their subparagraphs above, and incorporated herein as though set forth in full.

MATTERS IN AGGRAVATION

35. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed against Respondent Pharmacy, Complainant alleges that on or about May 17, 2018, in a prior action, the Board of Pharmacy issued Citation No. CI 2016 73115 and ordered Respondent Pharmacy to pay a fine in the amount of \$1,750. The cause for the citation was based on Respondent Pharmacy's failure to comply with Health and Safety Code section 111440 (unlawful for any person to manufacture, sell, deliver, hold, or offer for sale any drug or devise that is misbranded) and Business and Professions Code section 4081(a) (failure to completely account for all dangerous drugs on hand). Respondent Pharmacy was ordered to pay a fine in the amount of \$1,750.00.

OTHER MATTERS

36. Pursuant to Code section 4307, if Pharmacy Permit Number PHY 50710 issued to Quality Specialty Pharmacy Inc., dba, Quality Specialty Pharmacy is suspended, revoked, or placed on probation, and Respondent Tenenbaum, while acting as the manager, administrator, owner, member, officer, director, associate, or partner, had knowledge of or knowingly participated in any conduct for which Pharmacy Permit Number PHY 50710 was revoked, suspended, or placed on probation, Respondent Tenenbaum shall be prohibited from serving as a