1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California DIANN SOKOLOFF Supervising Deputy Attorney General JULIANNE MOSSLER Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 243749 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor P.O. Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550 Telephone: (510) 879-1349 Facsimile: (510) 622-2270 E-mail: Julianne.Mossler@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant			
9	BEFORE THE			
10	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS			
11	STATE OF C.	ALIFORNIA		
12	In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:	Case No. 7929		
13	MCKENZI MARIE KOOMAS			
14	Pharmacy Technician License Applicant	STATEMENT OF ISSUES		
15	Respondent.			
16				
17	DAD	FIEC		
18				
19		s this Statement of Issues solely in her official		
20	capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer			
21	Affairs.	anning de an anglication for a Dhamasan		
22	2. On or about June 3, 2024, the Board received an application for a Pharmacy			
23	Technician License from McKenzi Marie Kooma	` -		
24	Respondent certified under penalty of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and			
25	representations in the application. The Board denied the application on October 3, 2024.			
26	<u>JURISDICTION</u>			
27	3. This Statement of Issues is brought before the Board for the Department of Consumer			
28	Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and			
	1			

5

7

9

10

1112

13

15

14

16

17

18 19

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the application is made, regardless of whether the applicant was incarcerated for that crime, or the applicant has been convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the application is made and for which the applicant is presently incarcerated or for which the applicant was released from incarceration within the preceding seven years from the date of application. . .

8. Code section 493, subdivision (a), states:

Notwithstanding any other law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred, but only of that fact.

9. Code section 4301 states in relevant 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:

. . .

(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 (commencing with Section 801) of Title 21 of the United States Code regulating controlled substances or of a violation of the statutes of this state regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs shall be conclusive evidence of unprofessional conduct. In all other cases, the record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred. The board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, in order to fix the degree of discipline or, in the case of a conviction not involving controlled substances or dangerous drugs, to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this provision. The board may take action when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing the person to withdraw their plea of guilty

ĺ			
1	and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment.		
2			
3	10. Code section 4022 states:		
4	Dangerous drug or dangerous device means any drug or device unsafe for self-use in humans or animals, and includes the following:		
5	(a) Any drug that bears the legend: Caution: federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription, Rx only, or words of similar import.		
7	(b) Any device that bears the statement: Caution: federal law restricts this		
8	device to sale by or on the order of a , Rx only, or words of similar		
9			
10	(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.		
11	REGULATORY PROVISIONS		
12	11. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, states in relevant part:		
13	(a) For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a personal or facility		
14	considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of the practic		
1516	profession, or occupation that may be performed under the license type sought or held if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of an applicant or licensee to perform the functions authorized by the license in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare.		
17 18	(b) In making the substantial relationship determination required under subdivision (a) for a crime, the board will consider the following criteria:		
19	(1) The nature and gravity of the offense;		
20	(2) The number of years elapsed since the date of the offense; and		
21	(3) The nature and duties of the practice, profession, or occupation that may be		
22	performed under the license type sought or held.		
23	(c) For purposes of subdivision (a), substantially related crimes, professional misconduct, or acts shall include, but are not limited to, those which:		
24			
25	(5) Involve a conviction for driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol.		
26	<u>BACKGROUND</u>		
27	February 7, 2020, Arrest and February 9, 2022, Conviction		
28	12. On or about February 7, 2020, at 8:20 p.m., a Fullerton Police Officer conducted a		

traffic stop on a vehicle that was observed swerving, operating with no headlights on during darkness, failing to stop before the limit line at a red light and rapidly changing lanes in front of another vehicle. The officer contacted the driver, later identified as Respondent, who handed the officer what appeared to be a false driver's license. When questioned after a record check, Respondent admitted the card was fake. Respondent provided the officer with her real birthdate which revealed that she was 19 years old. While speaking with Respondent, the officer noticed she was displaying signs and symptoms of alcohol intoxication. Respondent admitted to consuming alcohol before driving. Additionally, the officer noticed an empty glass bottle of Ciroc liquor on the driver's side floorboard of Respondent's vehicle. In response to the officer's questions, Respondent admitted to consuming two to three beers and a half bottle of Ciroc liquor between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and approximately 7:30 p.m. Respondent performed poorly on the field sobriety tests and refused to participate in a preliminary alcohol screening test. When Respondent refused to submit to a chemical test, a warrant was obtained for a sample of her blood. At approximately 10:49 p.m. a sample of Respondent's blood was drawn that revealed a Blood Alcohol Content of 0.208 percent.

13. On or about February 9, 2022, in the criminal case entitled *The People of the State of California v. McKenzi Marie Koomas*, Case No., in Orange County Superior Court of California, Case No. 21NM01077, Respondent was convicted, based on a plea of guilty, of one count of driving under the influence of alcohol, one count of driving with a .08% or higher blood alcohol concentration, one count of under 21 and driving with a blood alcohol of 0.01 or greater, and one count of false representation to a peace officer. (Veh. Code §§ 23152, subds. (a), (b), 23136, subd. (a); Penal Code § 148.9, subd. (a).) As part of the conviction, Respondent admitted to an enhancement of driving with a blood alcohol concentration over .20% (Veh. Code, § 23538, subd. (b)(2).) and an enhancement of refusing a peace officer's request to submit to a chemical test (Veh. Code, § 23612). The court placed Respondent on probation for five years with various terms and conditions. These terms included successfully completing an 18-month Multiple Offender Alcohol Program, paying a base fine in the amount of \$390 plus additional, penalties, fines, and fees.

	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	
2	7	
`	Ω	

14. On or about March 19, 2020, at 10:16 p.m., Fullerton Police Officers responded to a
report of a vehicle that collided into a traffic light. When officers arrived at the scene, they
observed a damaged traffic signal and a vehicle with significant front-end damage in a nearby gas
station parking lot. A witness at the scene reported hearing tires screech, then seeing a vehicle
lose control and strike the traffic signal. The witness reported that the vehicle nearly struck a
pedestrian standing on the corner of the intersection. The witness said that he saw a male
passenger exit the vehicle and leave the location, and that a female (identified as Respondent)
attempted to get the male to return to the vehicle. The witness did not see another vehicle
traveling in the intersection at the time of the accident. A second witness was interviewed at the
scene and stated that he was inside the gas station when he heard what sounded like a vehicle
losing control. The second witness saw a vehicle collide into a traffic signal and come to a stop
in the gas station parking lot. The second witness identified Respondent as the driver. When an
officer contacted Respondent, she was sitting in the driver seat of the vehicle with the door ajar.
Respondent initially denied that she was driving and claimed that her friend was driving, but after
she was told that there were witnesses to the collision, she admitted she was the driver.
Respondent said that she was traveling eastbound and started to make a left turn when she saw
another vehicle travelling through the intersection. She struck the traffic signal in her attempt to
avoid the other vehicle. Respondent reported that she had a passenger in the vehicle at the time of
the collision, but he left before police arrived. Officers were unable to locate the passenger.
While speaking with Respondent, the reporting officer detected the odor of an alcoholic beverage
emitting from her person and noticed she was displaying signs and symptoms of alcohol
intoxication. A DUI investigation was initiated and during questioning, Respondent admitted to
consuming four beers between the hours of 7:30 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. but refused to participate in
field sobriety tests and asked for a lawyer. Respondent agreed to submit to a preliminary alcohol
screening test and provided two breath samples beginning at 11:04 p.m. which Blood Alcohol
Content readings of 0.181 percent and 0.173 percent. During an inventory search a bottle of
Ciroc vodka was found in the back seat of Respondent's vehicle. The bottle was approximately a

quarter full, and Respondent admitted the vodka bottle belonged to her. Respondent was placed under arrest for driving under the influence of alcohol. Respondent agreed to provide two more breath samples that showed Blood Alcohol Content readings of 0.149 percent and 0.156 percent.

15. On or about February 9, 2022, in the criminal case entitled *The People of the State of California v. McKenzi Marie Koomas*, Case No., in Orange County Superior Court of California, Case No. 20NM05192, Respondent entered a plea of guilty to one count of driving under the influence of alcohol, one count of driving with a .08% or higher blood alcohol concentration, one count of possession of alcoholic beverage by a minor, and one count of driving with blood alcohol .05% or more and under the age of 21 years. (Veh. Code, §§ 23152, subds. (a), (b), 25662, subd. (a), 23140, subd. (a).) As part of the conviction, Respondent admitted to an enhancement of under 21 – driving privilege suspended (Veh. Code, § 13202.5, subd. (a).) and an enhancement of BAC of 0.15% or above. (Veh. Code, § 23578.) The court placed Respondent on probation for three years with various terms and conditions. These terms included successfully completing an 18-month Multiple Offender Alcohol Program, paying a base fine in the amount of \$390 plus additional, penalties, fines, and fees.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION (Unprofessional Conduct – Dangerous Use of Alcohol)

16. Respondent's application for a Pharmacy Technician License is subject to denial in that Respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct by using alcohol in a dangerous and injurious manner. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 480, subd. (a)(3), 4300, subd. (c), 4301, subd. (h).) The circumstances are more fully explained in paragraphs 12 through 15, above.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION(Unprofessional Conduct - Substantially Related Conviction)

17. Respondent's application for a Pharmacy Technician License is subject to denial in that Respondent was convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol, which is a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 480, subd. (a)(3), 4301, subd. (l); Cal. Code. Regs., tit. 16 § 1770, subds. (a) and (c)(5).) The circumstances are more fully explained in paragraphs 12 through 15, above.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION 1 (Unprofessional Conduct – Multiple Alcohol-Related Convictions) 2 Respondent's application for a Pharmacy Technician License is subject to denial in 3 that Respondent has multiple convictions for driving under the influence of alcohol. (Bus. & 4 Prof. Code, §§ 480, subd. (a)(3), 4300, subd. (c), 4301, subd. (k).) The circumstances are more 5 fully explained in paragraphs 12 through 15, above. 6 **PRAYER** 7 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters alleged in this 8 Statement of Issues, and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision: 9 Denying the application of McKenzi Marie Koomas for a Pharmacy Technician 10 License; 11 2. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 12 Digitally signed by Sodergren, Sodergren, 13 Anne@DCA Date: 2025.01.13 18:51:34 Anne@DCA 14 DATED: 1/13/2025 -08'00' ANNE SODERGREN 15 **Executive Officer** Board of Pharmacy 16 Department of Consumer Affairs State of California 17 Complainant 18 OK 2024900578 91924125.docx 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28