

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

**In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:**

**RA'SHI MIGNON JOHNSON, Respondent**

**Agency Case No. 7467**

**OAH No. 2023040739**

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The attached Proposed Decision of the Administrative Law Judge 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 July 26, 2023.

It is so ORDERED on June 26, 2023.

BOARD OF PHARMACY  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By



Seung W. Oh, Pharm.D.  
Board President

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

**In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:**

**RA'SHI MIGNON JOHNSON, Respondent**

**Agency Case No. 7467**

**OAH No. 2023040739**

**PROPOSED DECISION**

Jessica Wall, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), State of California, heard this matter by videoconference on May 8, 2023, from Sacramento, California.

Katelyn E. Docherty, Deputy Attorney General, represented Anne Sodergren, Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California (complainant).

Ra'shi Mignon Johnson (respondent) represented himself.

Evidence was received and the record was left open for respondent to submit exhibits and complainant to file objections. Respondent did not submit any exhibits by the deadline. On May 22, 2023, the record closed and the matter submitted for decision.

## **FACTUAL FINDINGS**

### **Jurisdictional Matters**

1. On August 9, 2022, the Board received respondent's pharmacy technician application. On January 26, 2023, the Board denied respondent's application based on his criminal history. On January 31, 2023, the Board received respondent's appeal.

2. On April 15, 2023, complainant signed and later filed the Statement of Issues for the purpose of respondent's appeal. Complainant alleged cause to deny respondent's application for three reasons. First, complainant alleged respondent's two criminal convictions in the past seven years were substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a pharmacy technician. Second, complainant alleged that respondent's application was subject to denial based on his dangerous use of alcohol. Third, complainant alleged that respondent was convicted of multiple misdemeanors involving the consumption of alcohol. This hearing followed.

### **Respondent's Convictions**

3. On August 29, 2016, in San Joaquin County Superior Court, respondent was convicted on his no contest plea of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) (driving with a blood alcohol content [BAC] of 0.08 percent or higher), a misdemeanor. Respondent also admitted special allegations under Vehicle Code section 23578 (driving with a BAC of 0.15 percent or greater). The court suspended imposition of sentence and placed respondent on probation for three years with conditions including that he serve seven days in the Sheriff Work Project, complete a three-month multiple offender driving under the influence (DUI) program, and pay fines and fees.

The circumstances underlying respondent's 2016 conviction occurred on August 6, 2016. At 5:12 a.m. that morning, Stockton Police Department officers responded to a report of a vehicle stopped in traffic at an intersection. When they arrived, they observed respondent asleep and hunched over his vehicle's steering wheel with the vehicle still in drive. The officers woke respondent by knocking on his window. When respondent exited the vehicle, the officers observed multiple signs of intoxication. His BAC measured 0.15 percent via two breath samples.

4. On April 26, 2021, in San Joaquin County Superior Court, respondent was convicted on his no contest plea of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) (DUI), a misdemeanor. Respondent also admitted special allegations under Vehicle Code sections 23578 (driving with a BAC of 0.15 percent or greater) and 23540 (prior DUI conviction within 10 years). Respondent was also convicted on his no contest plea of violating Vehicle Code section 12500, subdivision (a) (driving without a valid driver's license), a misdemeanor. The court suspended imposition of sentence and placed respondent on probation for five years with conditions including that he serve 19 days in jail, complete an 18-month multiple offender DUI program, and pay fines and fees.

The circumstances underlying respondent's 2021 conviction occurred on April 11, 2021. At 11:35 p.m. that night, Stockton Police Department officers responded to a report of a traffic collision. When officers arrived, respondent was in a field near the intersection, screaming and crying that he was sorry. Initially, respondent told the firefighters that he had been drinking and driving. When later asked by police officers, respondent became agitated, responded "I don't know" to almost all questions asked, and denied driving. Officers determined that respondent showed multiple signs of intoxication and had a suspended/revoked driver's license from his prior DUI. After speaking with a witness, officers determined that respondent was at fault in the

collision because he had run the red light and crashed into the other vehicle. The driver of that vehicle had to be transported to the hospital to treat his injuries.

After officers transported respondent to the police department, he calmed down and apologized. He failed to successfully complete field sobriety tests. His BAC measured 0.24 percent. In his statement to the officers, respondent said that he had been eating barbeque with a friend and consumed three beers, 45 minutes apart, before driving. After officers transported respondent to the hospital to treat any possible injuries, he became agitated again and refused to cooperate with medical staff. Once respondent was medically cleared, officers transported him to jail. Still upset, respondent threatened to sue the officer booking him.

## **Duties of a Pharmacy Technician**

5. James Flores has been a licensed pharmacist for over 23 years. He has worked as an inspector for the Board for about seven years. Before working for the Board, he worked as a pharmacist for the United States Air Force, the Department of Veterans Affairs, a retail pharmacy, and a hospital, among other positions. He is familiar with the duties of a pharmacy technician. At hearing, he explained that pharmacy technicians perform non-discretionary tasks under supervision, such as handling and measuring controlled substances and interacting with the public. Based on their responsibilities, the Board expects pharmacy technicians to exercise good judgment, integrity, and reliability. Their tasks often require attention to detail because errors could harm the public.

## **Respondent's Evidence**

6. Respondent explained the 2016 conviction occurred on the day he found out a child he had raised for four years was not his biological child. He went to a

friend's house and "had shots." Afterward, as he drove home, he fell asleep at the wheel. Following the 2016 conviction, respondent completed the DUI program and three years of probation. He recalled that he did not consume alcohol for about two years after this conviction.

7. Respondent explained the 2021 incident arose after he drank to cope with the grief he felt from his mother's death a few years earlier. He acknowledged that he caused the accident but had no memory of what occurred that night, including both the accident and his arrest. He did not know that his driver's license was suspended at the time of the accident. He also did not remember pleading no contest to violating Vehicle Code section 12500, subdivision (a). After the 2021 conviction, respondent completed an 18-month DUI class. He stated that he has complied with every requirement imposed by the court, including having an ignition interlock device (IID) installed in his car. He was allowed to remove the IID three weeks ago. His criminal probation will continue until April 2026.

8. Currently, respondent works as a clerk at Rite Aid pharmacy. As a clerk, he puts inputs customer information, retrieves prescriptions, and receives payment from customers for their prescriptions. Rite Aid gave him the opportunity to take part in Pharmacy Technicians University, after which he applied to the Board. He said that Rite Aid is aware of his conviction history. Respondent would love to be a pharmacy technician and hopes to work towards his goal of becoming a pharmacist.

9. Respondent was "devastated" after both convictions. He explained that he is "not that guy anymore" and no longer consumes alcohol or hangs around with his former friends. He began going to church in December 2022 and attends Sunday services about once every three weeks. He gives the Board his word that he will not

commit future misconduct. He wants the chance to better his life and provide for his family.

10. Respondent stopped drinking after the April 2021 accident. He does not consider the date he stopped drinking to be a sobriety date. He does not believe that he ever had a problem with alcohol. Respondent has not received any treatment for substance use disorder or attended dependency support groups. Instead of drinking, he now prays, reads, talks to his deacon, runs, works out, journals, and finds positive things to do with his time. He has not participated in counseling or therapy.

## **Analysis**

11. Respondent's multiple DUI convictions show a potential lack of fitness to perform the functions authorized by a license consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare. (*Sulla v. Bd. of Registered Nursing* (2012) 205 Cal.App.4th 1195.) As explained in *Griffiths v. Superior Court* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 757, "driving under the influence of alcohol threatens personal safety and places the safety of the public in jeopardy." (*Id.*, at p. 770.) A DUI conviction also shows "an inability or unwillingness to obey the legal prohibition against drinking and driving and constitutes a serious breach of a duty owed to society." (*Ibid.*)

12. When determining whether to deny a license, the Board considers the following criteria where the applicant has not completed the criminal sentence at issue: (1) the nature and gravity of the crimes under consideration as grounds for denial; (2) evidence of any subsequent misconduct; (3) the time that has elapsed since commission of the crimes; (4) whether the applicant has complied with any terms of probation, restitution, or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the applicant; (5) evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the applicant; (6) the lengths of the

applicable probation periods; (7) the terms or conditions of probation and the extent to which they bear on the applicant's rehabilitation. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 1769, subd. (b)(2).)

13. The nature and severity of respondent's offenses are serious. On at least two occasions, respondent drove while under the influence of alcohol. In 2016, respondent's BAC was nearly twice the legal limit. In 2021, his BAC was three times the legal limit. Moreover, in 2021, respondent injured a member of the public because he chose to drive while intoxicated. Respondent is fortunate that his actions did not kill anyone. Only two years have passed since his most recent conviction.

14. Respondent is in the initial stages of his rehabilitation. He has been sober since 2021 and successfully completed the 18-month court-ordered DUI program. Nevertheless, he does not believe that he had a problem with alcohol, does not have a sobriety date, and has not participated in any dependency support groups. He has periodically attended church for the last six months but has not sought out counseling or therapy to address why he repeatedly turned to alcohol to cope with difficult emotions.

15. Respondent expressed remorse for his conduct and accepted responsibility for his actions. Fully acknowledging the wrongfulness of past actions is an essential step towards rehabilitation. (See *Seide v. Com. of Bar Examiners* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 933.) However, remorse alone does not demonstrate rehabilitation. A truer sign of rehabilitation comes from sustained conduct over an extended period. (*In re Menna* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 975, 991.) Respondent will be on criminal probation until 2026. While there is no evidence that respondent has driven while under the influence of alcohol since 2021, respondent's good conduct on probation receives little weight. This is because individuals under the direct supervision of probation authorities must behave



in an exemplary fashion. (*In re Gossage* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1080, 1099.) To properly evaluate respondent's rehabilitation, the Board needs to review his conduct after probation has ended.

## **LEGAL CONCLUSIONS**

### **Burden and Standard Of Proof**

1. An applicant for a license bears the burden of proving that the Board should grant him a license. (*Martin v. Alcohol Beverage Control Appeals Bd.* (1959) 52 Cal.2d 238.) The burden of proof is by a preponderance of the evidence. (Evid. Code, § 115.)

### **Cause to Deny Application**

2. The Board may deny a license to an applicant who has been convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a Board licensee. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 480, subd. (a)(1), 4300, subd. (c), & 4301, subd. (l).) Under California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, subdivision (c)(5), respondent's two convictions for DUI are substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a Board licensee because they each involved "a conviction for driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol." Cause therefore exists to deny respondent's application for a pharmacy technician license under Business and Professions Code sections 480, subdivision (a)(1); 4300, subdivision (c); and 4301, subdivision (l).

3. The Board may deny a license to an applicant who has engaged in unprofessional conduct, including "the use of ... alcoholic beverages to the extent or in

a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to oneself ... or to any other person or to the public[.]” (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 4300, subd. (c) & 4301, subd. (h).) The conduct underlying respondent’s two recent convictions involved using alcohol to an extent or in a manner that was dangerous to himself and the public. Cause therefore exists to deny respondent’s application for a pharmacy technician license under Business and Professions Code sections 4300, subdivision (c), and 4301, subdivision (h).

4. The Board may deny a license to an applicant who has engaged in unprofessional conduct, which includes the “conviction of more than one misdemeanor ... involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any dangerous drug or alcoholic beverage, or any combination of those substances.” (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 4300, subd. (c) & 4301, subd. (k).) Respondent’s two recent misdemeanor convictions each involved the consumption of alcohol. Cause therefore exists to deny respondent’s application for a pharmacy technician license under Business and Professions Code sections 4300, subdivision (c), and 4301, subdivision (k).

## **Determination**

5. Protecting the public is the Board’s highest priority and the paramount concern when exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 4001.1.) Respondent bore the burden to demonstrate that he can be relied upon to obey all Board laws and regulations, and act in a manner that is upright, honest, and consistent with professional standards of conduct. While respondent is on the path towards rehabilitation, insufficient time has elapsed for respondent to show his willingness and ability to independently follow the law. Accordingly, respondent’s efforts did not establish that he has sufficiently rehabilitated such that it would be consistent with the public health, safety, and welfare to issue him a pharmacy technician license at this time.

## ORDER

Respondent Ra'shi Mignon Johnson's application for a pharmacy technician license is DENIED.

DATE: May 23, 2023

*Jessica Wall*  
Jessica Wall (May 23, 2023 11:46 PDT)

JESSICA WALL

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings

1 ROB BONTA  
Attorney General of California  
2 KAREN R. DENVIR  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
3 KATELYN E. DOCHERTY  
Deputy Attorney General  
4 State Bar No. 322028  
1300 I Street, Suite 125  
5 P.O. Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550  
6 Telephone: (916) 210-6277  
Facsimile: (916) 327-8643  
7 *Attorneys for Complainant*

8  
9 **BEFORE THE**  
**BOARD OF PHARMACY**  
10 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**  
11 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

12 In the Matter of the Statement of Issues  
13 Against:

Case No. 7467

14 **RA'SHI MIGNON JOHNSON**

**STATEMENT OF ISSUES**

15 **Pharmacy Technician License Applicant**

16 Respondent.  
17

18  
19 **PARTIES**

20 1. Anne Sodergren (Complainant) brings this Statement of Issues solely in her official  
21 capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.

22 2. On or about August 9, 2022, the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of  
23 Consumer Affairs, received an application for a Pharmacy Technician License from Ra'Shi  
24 Mignon Johnson (Respondent). On or about August 8, 2022, Respondent certified under penalty  
25 of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and representations in the application.  
26 The Board denied the application on January 26, 2023.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **JURISDICTION**

2 3. This Statement of Issues is brought before the Board under the authority of the  
3 following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless  
4 otherwise indicated.

5 4. Section 4300, subdivision (c), of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board  
6 may refuse a license to any applicant guilty of unprofessional conduct. The Board may, in its sole  
7 discretion, issue a probationary license to any applicant for a license who is guilty of  
8 unprofessional conduct and who has met all other requirements for licensure.

9 **STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

10 5. Section 480 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

11 (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this code, a board may deny a  
12 license regulated by this code on the grounds that the applicant has been convicted of  
13 a crime or has been subject to formal discipline only if either of the following  
14 conditions are met:

15 (1) The applicant has been convicted of a crime within the preceding seven  
16 years from the date of application that is substantially related to the qualifications,  
17 functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the application is made,  
18 regardless of whether the applicant was incarcerated for that crime, or the applicant  
19 has been convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications,  
20 functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the application is made  
21 and for which the applicant is presently incarcerated or for which the applicant was  
22 released from incarceration within the preceding seven years from the date of  
23 application. . . .

24 6. Section 493 of the Code states:

25 (a) Notwithstanding any other law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the  
26 department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a  
27 license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the  
28 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.

(b)

(1) Criteria for determining whether a crime is substantially related to the  
qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession the board regulates shall  
include all of the following:

(A) The nature and gravity of the offense.

1  
2  
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

(B) The number of years elapsed since the date of the offense.

(C) The nature and duties of the profession.

(2) A board shall not categorically bar an applicant based solely on the type of conviction without considering evidence of rehabilitation.

(c) As used in this section, “license” includes “certificate,” “permit,” “authority,” and “registration.” . . .

7. 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 includes, 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.

(l) 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 his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment. . . .

1 **REGULATORY PROVISIONS**

2 8. California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 16, section 1769, provides, in  
3 pertinent part:

4 ...

5 (b) Denial of a license.

6 (1) When considering the denial of a facility or personal license under Section  
7 480 of the Business and Professions Code on the grounds that the applicant has been  
8 convicted of a crime, the board will consider whether the applicant made a showing  
9 of rehabilitation if the applicant completed the criminal sentence at issue without a  
violation of parole or probation. In making this determination, the board will consider  
the following criteria:

10 (A) The nature and gravity of the crime(s).

11 (B) The length(s) of the applicable parole or probation period(s).

12 (C) The extent to which the applicable parole or probation period was shortened  
13 or lengthened, and the reason(s) the period was modified.

14 (D) The terms or conditions of parole or probation and the extent to which they  
15 bear on the applicant's rehabilitation.

16 (E) The extent to which the terms or conditions of parole or probation were  
17 modified, and the reason(s) for modification.

18 (2) If the applicant has not completed the criminal sentence at issue without a  
19 violation of parole or probation, or the board determines that the applicant did not  
20 make the showing of rehabilitation based on the criteria in paragraph (1) or the denial  
is based on professional misconduct, the board will apply the following criteria in  
evaluating an applicant's rehabilitation:

21 (A) The nature and gravity of the act(s), professional misconduct, or crime(s)  
22 under consideration as grounds for denial.

23 (B) Evidence of any act(s), professional misconduct, or crime(s) committed  
24 subsequent to the act(s), professional misconduct, or crime(s) under consideration as  
grounds for denial under Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code.

25 (C) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s), professional  
26 misconduct, or crime(s) referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B).

27 (D) Whether the applicant has complied with any terms of parole, probation,  
28 restitution or any other sanctions lawfully imposed against the applicant.

1 (E) The criteria in paragraphs (1)(A) through (E), as applicable.

2 (F) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the applicant, including as  
3 provided in the board's Disciplinary Guidelines, identified in section 1760.

4 ...

5 9. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, states:

6 (a) For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a personal or facility  
7 license pursuant to Section 141 or Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the  
8 Business and Professions Code, a crime, professional misconduct, or act shall be  
9 considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of the  
10 practice, profession, or occupation that may be performed under the license type  
11 sought or held if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of  
12 an applicant or licensee to perform the functions authorized by the license in a  
13 manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare.

14 (b) In making the substantial relationship determination required under  
15 subdivision (a) for a crime, the board will consider the following criteria:

16 (1) The nature and gravity of the offense;

17 (2) The number of years elapsed since the date of the offense; and

18 (3) The nature and duties of the practice, profession, or occupation that may be  
19 performed under the license type sought or held.

20 (c) For purposes of subdivision (a), substantially related crimes, professional  
21 misconduct, or acts shall include, but are not limited to, those which:

22 (1) Violate or attempt to violate, directly or indirectly, or to aid, abet or  
23 conspire to violate, any provision of law of this state, or any other jurisdiction,  
24 governing the practice of pharmacy.

25 (2) Violate or attempt to violate, directly or indirectly, or to aid, abet or  
26 conspire to violate, any provision of Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 801) of  
27 Title 21 of the United States Code regulating controlled substances or any law of this  
28 state, or any other jurisdiction, relating to controlled substances or dangerous drugs.

(3) Violate or attempt to violate, directly or indirectly, or to aid, abet or  
conspire to violate, any provision of law of this state, or any other jurisdiction,  
relating to government provided or government supported healthcare.

(4) Involve dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption related to money, items,  
documents, or personal information.

(5) Involve a conviction for driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

///

///

///



1 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION**

2 **(Criminal Convictions)**

3 10. Respondent's application is subject to denial under Code sections 480, subdivision  
4 (a)(1), 4300, subdivision (c), and 4301, subdivision (I), in conjunction with California Code of  
5 Regulations, title 16, section 1770, in that Respondent has been convicted of crimes which are  
6 substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a pharmacy technician.

7 11. On or about August 29, 2016, in a criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the*  
8 *State of California v. Rashi Johnson*, in San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case Number CR-  
9 2016-0011691, Respondent was convicted by plea of no contest of violating Vehicle Code section  
10 23152(b) (driving with a blood alcohol content of .08% or higher), a misdemeanor, with an  
11 enhancement under Vehicle Code sections 23578 (driving with a blood alcohol content of 0.15%  
12 or higher). Respondent was sentenced to seven days of Sheriff Work Project, placed on three  
13 years of probation with terms and conditions, ordered to complete an 3-month multiple offender  
14 DUI program and to pay fines. The circumstances are as follows:

15 a. On or about August 6, 2016, at approximately 5:12 a.m., officers with the  
16 Stockton Police Department (SPD) responded to a report of a vehicle stopped in traffic at an  
17 intersection with the driver hunched over the steering wheel. Upon arrival the officers noticed the  
18 driver, later identified as Respondent, was asleep with his foot on the brake pedal and the vehicle  
19 in drive. The officers woke Respondent by knocking on the windows of his vehicle. When  
20 Respondent exited his vehicle, the officers immediately smelled a strong odor of an alcoholic  
21 beverage emitting from Respondent's person, and noticed that he had slurred speech, and red,  
22 watery eyes. Respondent stated that he had no idea he was sleeping in traffic. Respondent told the  
23 officers he was on his way home after leaving work, and he did not remember what alcoholic  
24 beverage he had consumed. Respondent submitted to a series of field sobriety tests, which he was  
25 unable to perform as explained and demonstrated by the officer. Respondent submitted to a breath  
26 test and was determined to have a blood alcohol level of 0.15/.15%.

27 12. On or about April 26, 2021, in a criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State*  
28 *of California v. Rashi Johnson*, in San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case Number CR-2021-

1 0004037, Respondent was convicted by plea of no contest of violating Vehicle Code section  
2 23152(b) (driving with a blood alcohol content of .08% or higher), a misdemeanor, with  
3 enhancements under Vehicle Code sections 23578 (driving with a blood alcohol content of .15 %  
4 or higher) and 23540 (prior DUI conviction within 10 years). Respondent was also convicted by  
5 plea of no contest of violating Vehicle Code section 12500(a) (driving without a license), a  
6 misdemeanor. Respondent was sentenced to 19 days in jail, placed on five years of probation with  
7 terms and conditions, and ordered to complete an 18-month multiple offender DUI program and  
8 to pay fines. The circumstances are as follows:

9 a. On or about April 11, 2021, at approximately 11:35 p.m., SPD officers  
10 responded to a report of a traffic collision. Upon arriving at the scene, the officers found one of  
11 the drivers, later identified as Respondent, laying in a field at the corner of the intersection,  
12 screaming and crying "I'm sorry." Respondent told one of the officers that he consumed "a beer"  
13 approximately four hours prior. The officer noticed the odor of alcohol emitting from  
14 Respondent's person, as well as slurred speech, and red, watery eyes. The officer ran a DMV  
15 check and discovered that Respondent's driver's license was been suspended for a prior DUI.  
16 Respondent had admitted to a fireman that he was driving the vehicle, but when speaking to the  
17 SPD officers Respondent denied that he was driving the vehicle. Respondent submitted to a  
18 series of field sobriety tests, which he was unable to perform as explained and demonstrated by  
19 the officer. Respondent submitted to a breath test and was determined to have a blood alcohol  
20 level of 0.23/.24%. Respondent then gave the officers a statement stating he had consumed  
21 approximately 3 beers, and admitted to driving his vehicle at the time the collision took place.

22 **SECOND CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION**

23 **(Dangerous Use of Alcohol)**

24 13. Respondent's application is subject to denial under Code sections 4300, subdivision  
25 (c), and 4301, subdivision (h), in that, as set forth in paragraphs 11 and 12 above, on or about  
26 August 6, 2016, and April 11, 2021, Respondent used alcoholic beverages to an extent, or in a  
27 manner, as to be dangerous or injurious to himself, others, and the public.

28 ///

1  
2  
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

**THIRD CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION**

**(Unprofessional Conduct: Conviction of Multiple Misdemeanors Involving Alcoholic Beverages)**

14. Respondent's application is subject to denial under Code sections 4300, subdivision (c), and 4301, subdivision (k), in that, as set forth in paragraphs 11 and 12 above, Respondent was convicted of more than one misdemeanor involving the use, consumption or self-administration of alcohol.

**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. Denying the application of Ra'Shi Mignon Johnson for a Pharmacy Technician License;
- 2. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: 4/15/2023

Sodergren,  
 Anne@DCA  
 ANNE SODERGREN  
 Executive Officer  
 Board of Pharmacy  
 Department of Consumer Affairs  
 State of California  
*Complainant*

Digitally signed by Sodergren,  
 Anne@DCA  
 Date: 2023.04.15 06:21:58  
 -07'00'

SA2023300861  
37044614.docx