BEFORE THE NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF PHARMACY

In The Matter Of:

Reciprocity Application of Corinne Leigh Race ORDER DENYING RECIPROCITY

THIS MATTER came before the North Carolina Board of Pharmacy ("Board") concerning the application of Corinne Leigh Race ("Petitioner") to reciprocate a New York license to practice pharmacy. This matter was heard on July 19, 2011 by the Board located at 6015 Farrington Rd., Suite 201, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Board members Dennis, Minton, Chater, McLaughlin, Dennis, Chesson, and Marks heard Petitioner's request. Having heard the evidence presented and assessed the credibility of the testifying witnesses, the Board makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner presently holds a license to practice pharmacy in New York.

2. On May 20, 2010, Petitioner submitted a North Carolina Board of Pharmacy Reciprocity Data Questionnaire seeking to reciprocate her New York license to practice pharmacy.

3. Question 7 on that questionnaire asks "Have you at any point in your licensure as a pharmacist been charged by any Board of Pharmacy on matters which could have produced an action on your license? Any and all actions taken against your license must be disclosed regardless of when the action was taken. This includes any pending actions." Petitioner's response to this question was "No."
4. Petitioner’s signature on the questionnaire “affirm[ed] that I have answered the foregoing questions, and that my answers are true and correct. I understand that any false information given by me may subject me to refusal to be licensed, disciplinary action by the North Carolina Board of Pharmacy, and/or any license obtained shall be void and of no effect.”

5. On May 20, 2010, Petitioner completed a Reciprocity Candidate Questionnaire and submitted it to the Board. Question 4 on that document asked “Do you have PENDING, or have you EVER been subject to, disciplinary proceedings before any Board of Pharmacy? Any and all actions taken against your license must be disclosed regardless of when the action was taken. This includes any pending actions.” Petitioner’s response to this question was “No.”

6. Petitioner’s signature on this questionnaire “affirm[ed] that I have answered the foregoing questions and that my answers are true and correct. I understand that any false information given by me may subject me to disciplinary action by the North Carolina Board of Pharmacy.”

7. On April 12, 2011, Petitioner submitted a National Association of Boards of Pharmacy Official Application for Transfer of a Pharmacist License to the State of North Carolina. Question 2 of the “Professional History” section asked “Has your pharmacist license in any jurisdiction ever been revoked, suspended, restricted, terminated, or otherwise been subject to disciplinary action (public or private) by any board of pharmacy or other state authority?” Petitioner’s response to this question was “No.”

8. Petitioner signed the NABP application, thereby “affirm[ing] that I have read the foregoing paragraphs, and the information therein is complete, true, and correct. I understand that any false statements made by me in this Application may be punishable by law.”
9. In fact, Petitioner’s license to practice pharmacy in New York was disciplined in 1996 by the New York State Education Department Office of Professional Discipline. Petitioner’s license was charged, and she “agreed to be censured, reprimanded and fined by a NYS Violations Committee,” for a dispensing error that she committed.

10. Accordingly, Petitioner’s answers on the North Carolina and NABP questionnaires were untruthful.

11. Petitioner testified that because her 1996 violation of law was “minor,” she did not view the matter as “discipline.” Though Petitioner acknowledged having agreed to a censure, reprimand, and fine, she nonetheless asserted her belief that these punishments were not “discipline” because the violation of law was “minor.”

12. The Board does not find Petitioner’s explanations credible. And, in all events, such explanations do not alter the fact that Petitioner’s New York license to practice pharmacy was disciplined.

13. Petitioner presented mitigating evidence in the form of attestations of fitness and character.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Petitioner “made false representations or withheld material information in connection with securing a license or permit.” N.C.G.S. § 90-85.38(a)(1).

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Petitioner’s application to reciprocate her New York license is DENIED.

Petitioner may make a new application to reciprocate her New York license to North Carolina no earlier than ninety (90) days from the date of this Order.
This Order contains no promise or guarantee, express or implied, that any subsequent application will be approved. Any subsequent application will be assessed, when received, for compliance with North Carolina law, including complete and full disclosure of all information sought in the application materials.
This the 19th day of July, 2011.

NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF PHARMACY

By:

Jack W. Campbell IV
Executive Director
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on July 21, 2011, I caused a copy of this Order Denying Reciprocity to be served on Irving Louis Trust by certified mail, return receipt requested at the following address:

[Redacted]

cc: Race reciprocity file
Lawrence H. Mokhiber, Executive Director, New York Board of Pharmacy
89 Washington Avenue
2d Floor W
Albany, NY 12234-1000

Jack W. Campbell IV
Executive Director