BEFORE THE	
BOARD OF PHARMACY	
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 6325
WALGREENS #04517 2600 Mowry Avenue Fremont, CA 94538	DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER
Pharmacy License No. PHY 53062	[C C. I. 811520]
and	[Gov. Code, §11520]
WALGREENS #00900 2105 Morrill Avenue San Jose, CA 95132	ONLY AS TO RESPONDENT: KIM THIEN LE aka KIM T. LE
Pharmacy License No. PHY 52768	
and	
WALGREENS #05480 1833 N. Milpitas Boulevard Milpitas, CA 95035	
Pharmacy License No. PHY 52864	
and	
KIM THIEN LE aka KIM T. LE 1133 Park Glen Court	
Milpitas, CA 95035	
Pharmacy Technician License No. TCH 364	481
Responder	nts.
	<del></del>
	1 HIEN LE) DEFAULT DECISION & ORDER; Case No.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. On or about October 11, 2018, Virginia Herold, in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs, filed Accusation No. 6325 against several respondents including Respondent Kim Thien Le aka Kim T. Le (Respondent Le). Interim Executive Officer Anne Sodergren (Complainant) has since taken over the role of Complainant in this matter. (Accusation attached as Exhibit A.)
- 2. On or about February 15, 2001, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician License Number TCH 36481 to Respondent Le. The Pharmacy Technician License expired on October 31, 2008, and was subsequently cancelled. This lapse in licensure, however, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section(s) 118, subdivision (b), and/or 4300.1, does not deprive the [Board] of its authority to institute or continue this disciplinary proceeding.
- 3. On or about October 23, 2018, Respondent Le was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Accusation No. 6325, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4100, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board. Respondent's address of record was and is: 750 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, #BB21, Pomona, CA 91766. On or about October 26, 2018, another set of the above-described documents was served by Certified and First Class Mail to another address for Respondent Le: 1133 Park Glen Court, Milpitas, CA 95035.
- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505(c) and/or Business and Professions Code section 124.
  - 5. Government Code section 11506(c) states, in pertinent part:
  - (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense . . . and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation . . . not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense . . . shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.
- 6. The Board takes official notice of its records and the fact that Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of the Accusation, and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 6325.

- 7. California Government Code section 11520(a) states, in pertinent part:
- (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense . . . or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent . . . .
- 8. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this matter, as well as taking official notice of all the investigatory reports, exhibits and statements contained therein on file at the Board's offices regarding the allegations contained in Accusation No. 6325, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 6325, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.
- 9. The Board finds that the actual costs for Investigation and Enforcement are \$20,500.00 as of March 25, 2019.

# **DETERMINATION OF ISSUES**

- Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Le has subjected her Pharmacy
   Technician License No. TCH 36481 to discipline.
  - 2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 3. The Board of Pharmacy is authorized to revoke Respondent Le's Pharmacy
  Technician License based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation which are
  supported by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this case:
- a. In violation of Business and Professions Code section 4301, subdivision (f), Respondent Le committed acts involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption, when she posed as an intern pharmacist and pharmacist, accepted employment in those capacities, and acted as a pharmacist-in-charge, all without having the appropriate licensure.
- b. In violation of Business and Professions Code section 4301, subdivision(s) (j) and/or (o), and/or section(s) 4036 and/or 4051, Respondent Le performed tasks reserved to an intern pharmacist or pharmacist, in California, without appropriate licensure from the Board.

# **ORDER** 1 2 IT IS SO ORDERED that Pharmacy Technician License No. TCH 36481, issued to Respondent Kim Thien Le aka Kim T. Le, is revoked. 3 Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a 4 written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within 5 seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may 6 7 vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute. This Decision shall become effective on July 25, 2019. 8 It is so ORDERED on June 25, 2019. 9 10 11 **BOARD OF PHARMACY** DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 12 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 13 14 15 Victor Law, R.Ph. **Board President** 16 17 21396767.DOCX DOJ Matter ID:SF2017402528 18 Attachment: Exhibit A: Accusation 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

# Exhibit A

Accusation

XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California LINDA K, SCHNEIDER		
Senior Assistant Attorney General JOSHUA A. ROOM Supervising Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 214663		
Telephone: (415) 510-3512 Facsimile: (415) 703-5480		
Attorneys for Complainant		
BEFORE THE		
BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 6325	
WALGREENS #04517		
2600 Mowry Avenue Fremont, CA 94538	ACCUSATION	
Pharmacy License No. PHY 53062		
and	_	
WALGREENS #00900 2105 Morrill Avenue		
San Jose, CA 95132		
Pharmacy License No. PHY 52768		
and		
WALGREENS #05480 1833 N. Milpitas Boulevard Milpitas, CA 95035		
Pharmacy License No. PHY 52864		
and		
KIM THIEN LE aka KIM T. LE 1133 Park Glen Court Milpitas, CA 95035		
Pharmacy Technician License No. TCH 36481		
Respondents.		
1		

28 | ///

## **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 December 31, 2014, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy License Number PHY 53062 to Walgreens Co. dba Walgreens #04517 (Respondent Walgreens #04517). The Pharmacy License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December 1, 2018, unless renewed.
- 3. On or about December 31, 2014, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy License Number PHY 52768 to Walgreens Co. dba Walgreens #00900 (Respondent Walgreens #00900). The Pharmacy License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December 1, 2018, unless renewed.
- 4. On or about December 31, 2014, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy License Number PHY 52864 to Walgreens Co. dba Walgreens #05480 (Respondent Walgreens #05480). The Pharmacy License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December 1, 2018, unless renewed.
- 5. On or about February 15, 2001, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy Technician License Number TCH 36481 to Kim Thien Le aka Kim T. Le (Respondent Le). The Pharmacy Technician License expired on October 31, 2008, and was subsequently cancelled.

# **JURISDICTION**

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

9. 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 PROVISIONS

- 10. Section 4021 of the Code provides that a "controlled substance" means any substance listed in Chapter 2 (Section 11053 et seq.) of Division 10 of the Health and Safety Code.
  - 11. Section 4022 of the Code states:

"'Dangerous drug' or 'dangerous device' means any drug or device unsafe for self-use in humans or animals, and includes the following:

- (a) Any drug that bears the legend: "Caution: federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription," "Rx only," or words of similar import.
- (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 import, the blank to be filled in with the designation of the practitioner licensed to use or order use of the device.
- (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."
  - 12. Section 4036 of the Code states:

"'Pharmacist' means a natural person to whom a license has been issued by the board, under Section 4200, except as specifically provided otherwise in this chapter. The holder of an unexpired and active pharmacist license issued by the board is entitled to practice pharmacy as defined by this chapter, within or outside of a licensed pharmacy as authorized by this chapter."

- 13. Section 4051 of the Code states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, it is unlawful for any person to manufacture, compound, furnish, sell, or dispense any dangerous drug or dangerous device, or to dispense or compound any prescription pursuant to Section 4040 of a prescriber unless he or she is a pharmacist under this chapter. . . ."

- 14. Section 4081 of the Code states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) All records of manufacture and of sale, acquisition, or disposition of dangerous drugs or dangerous devices shall be at all times during business hours open to inspection by authorized officers of the law, and shall be preserved for at least three years from the date of making. . . .
- (b) The owner, officer, and partner of any pharmacy, wholesaler, or veterinary food-animal drug retailer shall be jointly responsible, with the pharmacist-in-charge or representative-in-charge, for maintaining the records and inventory described in this section."
  - 15. Section 4105 of the Code states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) All records or other documentation of the acquisition and disposition of dangerous drugs and dangerous devices by any entity licensed by the board shall be retained on the licensed premises in a readily retrievable form. . . .
- (c) The records required by this section shall be retained on the licensed premises for a period of three years from the date of making.
- (d) Any records that are maintained electronically shall be maintained so that the pharmacist-in-charge, [or] the pharmacist on duty if the pharmacist-in-charge is not on duty, . . . shall, at all times during which the licensed premises are open for business, be able to produce a hard copy and electronic copy of all records of acquisition or disposition or other drug or dispensing-related records maintained electronically. . . ."
- 16. Section 4301 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board shall take action against any licensee guilty of "unprofessional conduct," defined to include, but not be limited to:
- (f) The commission of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption, whether the act is committed in the course of relations as a licensee or otherwise, and whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not.
- (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.
- (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 . . . .

- 17. Section 4328 of the Code provides that it is unlawful for any person to permit the compounding or dispensing of prescriptions, or the furnishing of dangerous drugs, in his or her pharmacy, except by a pharmacist.
- 18. Section 4330 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that it is unlawful for any person who has obtained a license to conduct a pharmacy: to fail to place in charge of the pharmacy a pharmacist; to permit the compounding or dispensing of prescriptions, or the furnishing of dangerous drugs, except by a pharmacist; or to commit any act that would subvert or tend to subvert the efforts of the pharmacist-in-charge to comply with laws governing the pharmacy.
- 19. Section 4332 of the Code makes it unlawful for any person: to fail, neglect, or refuse to maintain the records required by Section 4081; or, when called upon by an authorized officer or a member of the board, to fail, neglect, or refuse to produce or provide the records within a reasonable time; or to willfully produce or furnish records that are false.
- 20. Section 4333 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that all prescriptions filled by a pharmacy and all other records required by Section 4081 shall be maintained on the premises and available for inspection by authorized officers of the law for a period of at least three years. In cases where the pharmacy discontinues business, these records shall be maintained in a board-licensed facility for at least three years.
- 21. Health and Safety Code section 11152 provides that no person shall write, issue, fill, compound, or dispense a prescription that does not conform to this division.
  - 22. Health and Safety Code section 11158 states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) Except as provided in Section 11159 [order for controlled substances for use by a patient in a county or licensed hospital] or in subdivision (b) of this section [prescriber dispensing of 72-hour supply of Schedule II controlled substance], no controlled substance classified in Schedule II shall be dispensed without a prescription meeting the requirements of this chapter. Except as provided in Section 11159 or when dispensed directly to an ultimate user by a practitioner, other than a pharmacist or pharmacy, no controlled substance classified in Schedule III, IV, or V may be dispensed without a prescription meeting the requirements of this chapter."

- (14)(A) A check box by the name of each prescriber when a form lists multiple prescribers.
- (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.

Health and Safety Code section 11162.1, subdivision (b), further provides that each batch of controlled substance prescription forms shall have the lot number printed on the form and each form within that batch shall be numbered sequentially beginning with the numeral one.

24. Health and Safety Code section 11164 states, in pertinent part:

"Except as provided in Section 11167 [emergency], no person shall prescribe a controlled substance, nor shall any person fill, compound, or dispense a prescription for a controlled substance, unless it complies with the requirements of this section.

- (a) Each prescription for a controlled substance classified in Schedule II, III, IV, or V, except as authorized by subdivision (b), shall be made on a controlled substance prescription form as specified in Section 11162.1 and shall meet the following requirements:
- (1) The prescription shall be signed and dated by the prescriber in ink and shall contain the prescriber's address and telephone number; the [patient name]; refill information, such as the number of refills ordered and whether the prescription is a first-time request or a refill; and the name, quantity, strength, and directions for use of the controlled substance prescribed.
- (2) The prescription shall also contain the address of the person for whom the controlled substance is prescribed. If the prescriber does not specify this address on the prescription, the [pharmacy] shall write or type the address on the prescription or maintain this information in a readily retrievable form in the pharmacy.
- (b)(1) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 11162.1, any controlled substance classified in Schedule III, IV, or V may be dispensed upon an oral or electronically transmitted prescription, which shall be produced in hard copy form and signed and dated by the pharmacist filling the prescription or by any other person expressly authorized by provisions of the Business and Professions Code. Any person who transmits, maintains, or receives any electronically transmitted prescription shall ensure the security, integrity, authority, and confidentiality of the prescription.

2

4

5

7

11

///

#### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

- 28. On or about August 8, 2017, during and subsequent to an inspection at Respondent Walgreens #04517, it was discovered that the pharmacy had dispensed prescriptions pursuant to controlled substance prescription forms that did not meet statutory requirements. These included:
  - RX 2895220 (alprazolam 2mg; patient MK)<sup>1</sup>: lacked "California Security Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription document.
  - RX 2895879 (alprazolam 2mg; patient HC): lacked "California Security
     Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription document.
  - RX 2935775 (alprazolam 2mg; patient MC): lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the prescription document; lacked "California Security Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to approved security printer by Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on prescription.
  - RX 2941746 (alprazolam 2mg; patient EC): lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the prescription document; lacked "California Security Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription.
  - RX 3012053 (alprazolam 2mg; patient LG): lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the prescription document; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Patient initials are used throughout to protect confidentiality.

- RX 3021321 (alprazolam 2mg; patient HC): lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the prescription document; lacked "California Security Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription.
- RX 3023970 (promethazine with codeine 10 mg/6.25mg per 5 ml; patient HC):
   lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the
   prescription document; lacked "California Security Prescription" watermark; lacked
   check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription.
- RX 3036290 (alprazolam 2mg; patient LC): lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the prescription document; lacked "California Security Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription.
- RX 3106606 (alprazolam 2mg; patient HC): lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the prescription document; lacked "California Security Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription.
- RX 3107433 (alprazolam 2mg; patient SC): lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern printed across the entire front of the prescription document; lacked "California Security Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills; lacked identifying number assigned to the approved security printer by the Department of Justice; and lacked lot and batch numbers printed on the prescription.

29. During and subsequent to this inspection, neither the pharmacist on duty nor the pharmacist-in-charge were able to locate the original prescription document for RX 3012053.
30. During and subsequent to this inspection, inquiry into the pharmacists responsible for

RX 3139666 (alprazolam 2mg; patient HJ): lacked latent, repetitive "void" pattern

Security Prescription" watermark; lacked check boxes to indicate number of refills.

printed across the entire front of the prescription document; lacked "California

- 30. During and subsequent to this inspection, inquiry into the pharmacists responsible for verifying and dispensing the controlled substance prescriptions at issue revealed that the initials KTL were listed as the verifying pharmacist for some of these prescriptions. Those initials were said to correspond to a Kim T. Le, then employed by Walgreens as a pharmacist and pharmacist-in-charge at Respondent Walgreens #00900, who had done remote electronic verification. This individual will hereafter be known as Kim Thien Le aka Kim T. Le (Respondent Le).
- 31. The Pharmacist License Number listed in Walgreens records for Respondent Le (RPH 58654) was subsequently identified as belonging to another licensed pharmacist with a similar name, who was not employed by Walgreens. When Respondent Le was confronted with this information, she claimed to be the holder of another Pharmacist License Number (RPH 52262). However, RPH 52262 was also determined to belong to another licensed pharmacist with a similar name, and not to Respondent Le. Subsequent investigation discovered that Respondent Le had previously been licensed as a Pharmacy Technician (TCH 36481), but that license had expired in 2008. Respondent Le had never been licensed as a Pharmacist.
- 32. Subsequent inquiry to Walgreens discovered that Respondent Le had also previously been a pharmacist and the pharmacist-in-charge at Respondent Walgreens #05480.
- 33. During a subsequent interview with Respondent Le, conducted shortly after the birth of her child, when she was confronted with the fact that the two license numbers she had claimed as her own belonged to other people, Respondent Le said "me and my son would be very grateful if you could just forget about this," "I will pay whatever fine," and promised she would "not be coming back to work as a pharmacist." When asked whether she was a licensed pharmacist, Respondent Le said yes, and said she had received a pharmacy degree from Creighton University in Nebraska. But she continued to avoid the question of what was her valid license number.

27

	34.	Subsequent inquiry to Creighton University revealed an entry in their files matching
Respo	onden	t Le's name and date of birth, but showing no undergraduate or graduate degree was
awaro	ded.	The entry in their files could simply have been the result of an inquiry by her, and did
not no	ecessa	rily indicate enrollment or matriculation. A subsequent inquiry to the agency that
licens	ses ph	armacists in Nebraska did not discover any licenses issued to Respondent Le.

- 35. Interviews with staff at Respondent Walgreens #00900 confirmed that Respondent Le had been observed undertaking tasks reserved to licensed pharmacists, including:
  - Performing activities that required the exercise of professional judgment;
  - Reducing oral and/or electronic prescriptions to writing;
  - Verifying non-controlled and controlled substance prescriptions;
  - Counseling patients regarding their prescriptions;
  - Administering immunizations/vaccinations to patients;
  - Supervising clerks, pharmacy technicians, intern pharmacists, and trainees;
  - Ordering non-controlled and controlled medications; and
  - Signing for delivered medications.
- 36. Subsequent inquiry to Walgreens discovered that Respondent Le had worked for Walgreens in one capacity or another since September 20, 1999. Her employment history was:
  - September 1999 March 2001: Pharmacy Cashier
  - March 2001 July 2001: Pharmacy Technician
  - July 2001 November 2006: Intern Pharmacist
  - November 2006 date of report: Pharmacist
    - April 2016 date of report: Pharmacy Manager (pharmacist-in-charge [PIC])
      - o April 2016 November 2016: PIC at Respondent Walgreens #05480
      - o November 2016 date of report: PIC at Respondent Walgreens #00900
- 37. The Pharmacist License Number listed in Walgreens records was the first number identified in paragraph 31, above (RPH 58654), which belonged to another licensed pharmacist that was not employed by Walgreens.
  - 38. Board records show no intern or pharmacist license(s) issued to Respondent Le.

- 39. Walgreens did not have or keep any proof of Respondent Le's enrollment in or graduation from an accredited pharmacy school, nor did Walgreens have or keep copies of any of Respondent Le's purported licenses. Walgreens could not say whether or not Respondent Le's Pharmacy Technician, (purported) Intern Pharmacist, or (purported) Pharmacist licensure papers were requested or reviewed prior to hiring. Walgreens was also not able to locate a copy of any application for employment completed by Respondent Le.
- 40. During the investigation, Walgreens provided documentation demonstrating that Respondent Le had, during her tenure as a pharmacist with Walgreens, "performed one of the pharmacist required steps, i.e., data entry review, drug utilization review, or product verification," between November 1, 2006 and September 30, 2017, for a total of 745,355 prescriptions in a total of 395 Walgreens pharmacies (many by remote), 100,701 of those for controlled substances. The greatest number of verifications had been performed in or for Respondent Walgreens #04517.

## CAUSES FOR DISCIPLINE AS TO RESPONDENT LE

#### FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Acts Involving Moral Turpitude, Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit or Corruption)

41. Respondent Le is subject to discipline under section 4301, subdivision (f) of the Code, in that Respondent, as described in paragraphs 30 to 40 above, committed acts involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption, when she posed as an intern pharmacist and pharmacist, accepted employment in those capacities, and acted as a pharmacist-in-charge, all without having the appropriate licensure to perform the necessary tasks.

#### SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

#### (Unlicensed Practice as Intern Pharmacist and Pharmacist)

42. Respondent Le is subject to discipline under section 4301, subdivision(s) (j) and/or (o), and/or section(s) 4036 and/or 4051 of the Code, in that Respondent, as described in paragraphs 30 to 40 above, performed tasks reserved to an intern pharmacist or pharmacist, in California, without appropriate licensure from the Board to permit those tasks.

	п
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

25

26

27

28

#### CAUSES FOR DISCIPLINE AS TO WALGREENS RESPONDENTS

#### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Permitting Unlicensed Person to Act as Intern Pharmacist or Pharmacist)

43. Respondents Walgreens #04517, Walgreens #00900, and Walgreens #05480 are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301, subdivision(s) (j) and/or (o), and/or section(s) 4328 and/or 4330 of the Code, in that Respondents, as described in paragraphs 30 to 40 above, permitted the compounding or dispensing of prescriptions, or the furnishing of dangerous drugs, by Respondent Le, who was not then licensed as an intern pharmacist or pharmacist.

#### FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Failing to Place Pharmacist in Charge of Pharmacy)

44. Respondents Walgreens #00900 and Walgreens #05480 are each and severally subject to discipline under section 4301, subdivision(s) (j) and/or (o), and/or section 4330 of the Code, in that Respondents, as described in paragraphs 30 to 40 above, failed to place a licensed pharmacist in charge of the pharmacy while Respondent Le served as pharmacist-in-charge.

## FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

#### (Dispensing Pursuant to Non-Compliant Prescriptions)

45. Respondent Walgreens #04517 is subject to discipline under section 4301, subdivision(s) (j) and/or (o), and/or Health and Safety Code section(s) 11152, 11158, 11162.1, and/or 11164, in that Respondent, as described in paragraph 28 above, dispensed prescriptions pursuant to controlled substance prescription forms that did not meet statutory requirements.

#### SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

#### (Failing to Provide Records)

46. Respondent Walgreens #04517 is subject to discipline under section 4301, subdivision(s) (j) and/or (o), and/or section(s) 4081, 4105, 4332, and/or 4333 of the Code, in that, as described in paragraph 29 above, neither the pharmacist on duty nor the pharmacist-in-charge was able to retrieve or produce the original prescription document pertaining to **RX 3012053**.

#### SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Lack of Documentation of Pharmacist Verification)

Respondent Walgreens #04517 is subject to discipline under section 4301, subdivision(s) (j) and/or (o), and/or California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1717, in that, as described in paragraphs 30 to 40 above, verifications on prescriptions were performed by an individual not holding a pharmacist license, so that no proper pharmacist was identified.

## **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:

- Revoking or suspending Pharmacy License Number PHY 53062, issued to Walgreens Co. dba Walgreens #04517 (Respondent Walgreens #04517);
- Revoking or suspending Pharmacy License Number PHY 52768, issued to Walgreens Co. dba Walgreens #00900 (Respondent Walgreens #00900);
- 3. Revoking or suspending Pharmacy License Number PHY 52864, issued to Walgreens Co. dba Walgreens #05480 (Respondent Walgreens #05480);
- Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician License Number TCH 36481, issued to Kim Thien Le aka Kim T. Le (Respondent Le);
- Ordering Respondents to pay the Board the reasonable costs of the investigation and 5. enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3; and,
  - Taking such other and further action as is deemed necessary and proper.

10/11/18 DATED:

Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California

Complainant

SF2017402528 21227736.docx

24

25

26

27