

1 ROB BONTA  
Attorney General of California  
2 STEVEN D. MUNI  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
3 AARON L. LENT  
Deputy Attorney General  
4 State Bar No. 256857  
1300 I Street, Suite 125  
5 P.O. Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550  
6 Telephone: (916) 210-7545  
Facsimile: (916) 327-2247  
7

8 *Attorneys for Complainant*

9  
10 **BEFORE THE**  
**MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**  
**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
12

13 In the Matter of the Accusation Against,

Case No. 800-2020-064962

14 **DEANNA S. LONG**  
15 **3384 La Canada Dr. Apt. 1**  
**Cameron Park, CA 95682-7982**

**DEFAULT DECISION**  
**AND ORDER**

16 Polysomnographic Technician License  
17 No. PTCN 340,

[Gov. Code, §11520]

18 Respondent.  
19

20 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

21 1. On or about July 14, 2021, Complainant William Prasifka, in his official capacity as  
22 the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, filed  
23 Accusation No. 800-2020-064962 against Deanna S. Long (Respondent) before the Medical  
24 Board of California.

25 2. On or about January 31, 2013, the Medical Board of California (Board) issued  
26 Polysomnographic Technician License No. PTCN 340 to Respondent. The Polysomnographic  
27 Technician License expired on January 31, 2021, and has not been renewed. A true and correct  
28

1 copy of Respondent's certified license history is attached as Exhibit 1 to the accompanying  
2 Default Decision Evidence Packet.<sup>1</sup>

3 3. On or about July 14, 2021, Tara Reasoner, an employee of the Complainant Agency,  
4 served by Certified and First Class Mail a copy of the Accusation No. 800-2020-064962,  
5 Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Government Code  
6 sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which  
7 was and is 3384 La Canada Dr. Apt. 1, Cameron Park, CA 95682-7982. A copy of the  
8 Accusation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as Exhibit 2, and are  
9 incorporated herein by reference.

10 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of  
11 Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c). On or about July 15, 2021, the U.S. Postal  
12 Service delivered the aforementioned documents. A printout of the online U.S. Postal Service  
13 delivery is attached as Exhibit 3, and is incorporated herein by reference.

14 5. On or about July 30, 2021, the Attorney General's Office mailed a Courtesy Notice of  
15 Default to Respondent's address of record. A copy of the Courtesy Notice of Default packet is  
16 attached as Exhibit 4, and is incorporated herein by reference.

17 6. On or about August 2, 2021, the U.S. Postal Service attempted delivery of the  
18 aforementioned documents and a U.S. Postal Service Notice was left at the Respondent's address  
19 of record mentioned above. A printout of the online U.S. Postal Service attempted delivery and  
20 notice is attached as Exhibit 5, and is incorporated herein by reference.

21 7. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:

22 (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent  
23 files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts  
24 of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall  
25 constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion  
26 may nevertheless grant a hearing.

27 <sup>1</sup> All exhibits are true and correct copies of the originals, and are attached to the  
28 accompanying Default Decision Evidence Packet. The Default Decision Evidence Packet is  
hereby incorporated by reference, in its entirety, as if fully set forth herein.

1           8.     Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of  
2 the Accusation, and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 800-  
3 2020-064962.

4           9.     California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:

5                 “(a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the  
6 hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions  
7 or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to  
8 respondent.”

9           10.    Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds  
10 Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on  
11 Respondent's express admissions by way of default and the evidence before it as contained in the  
12 separate accompanying “Default Decision Evidence Packet,” finds that the allegations in  
13 Accusation No. 800-2020-064962 are true and correct.

#### 14                                 **JURISDICTION**

15           11.    Business and Professions Code section 118 states, in pertinent part:

16                 “(b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license  
17 issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by  
18 order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written  
19 consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed,  
20 restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or  
21 continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by  
22 law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking  
23 disciplinary action against the license on any such ground.

24           12.    California Business and Professions Code section 2220 provides, in pertinent part,  
25 that the Board may take action against all persons guilty of violating the provisions of Chapter 5  
26 of Division 2 of that Code.

27           13.    Section 2227 of the Code states:

28                 “(a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge  
of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the  
Government Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or  
who has entered into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in  
accordance with the provisions of this chapter:

                  “(1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the board.

                  “(2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a period not to exceed one  
year upon order of the board.

1           “(3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation  
2 monitoring upon order of the board.

3           “(4) Be publicly reprimanded by the board. The public reprimand may  
4 include a requirement that the licensee complete relevant educational courses  
5 approved by the board.

6           “(5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as part of an order of  
7 probation, as the board or an administrative law judge may deem proper.

8           “(b) Any matter heard pursuant to subdivision (a), except for warning letters,  
9 medical review or advisory conferences, professional competency examinations,  
10 continuing education activities, and cost reimbursement associated therewith that  
11 are agreed to with the board and successfully completed by the licensee, or other  
12 matters made confidential or privileged by existing law, is deemed public, and  
13 shall be made available to the public by the board pursuant to Section 803.1.”

14       14.     Section 2234 of the Code, states, in pertinent part:

15           “The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with  
16 unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article,  
17 unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

18           “(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or  
19 abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.  
20 [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act].

21           “...

22           “(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption that is  
23 substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and  
24 surgeon.

25           “(f) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a  
26 certificate.

27           “...”

28       15.     Section 2236 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

          “(a) The conviction of any offense substantially related to the qualifications,  
functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon constitutes unprofessional conduct  
within the meaning of this chapter [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act]. The  
record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the  
conviction occurred.

          “...

          “(d) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction after a plea of nolo  
contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section and  
Section 2236.1. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence of the fact  
that the conviction occurred.”

16.     Section 2239 of the Code states:

1           “(a) The use or prescribing for or administering to himself or herself, of any  
2           controlled substance; or the use of any of the dangerous drugs specified in Section  
3           4022, or of alcoholic beverages, to the extent, or in such a manner as to be  
4           dangerous or injurious to the licensee, or to any other person or to the public, or to  
5           the extent that such use impairs the ability of the licensee to practice medicine  
6           safely or more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use,  
7           consumption, or self-administration of any of the substances referred to in this  
8           section, or any combination thereof, constitutes unprofessional conduct. The  
9           record of the conviction is conclusive evidence of such unprofessional conduct.

10           “(b) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo  
11           contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section. The  
12           Division of Medical Quality<sup>2</sup> may order discipline of the licensee in accordance  
13           with Section 2227 or the Division of Licensing may order the denial of the license  
14           when the time for appeal has elapsed or the judgment of conviction has been  
15           affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending  
16           imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of  
17           Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing such person to withdraw his or her  
18           plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of  
19           guilty, or dismissing the accusation, complaint, information, or indictment.”<sup>3</sup>

20           17. Section 2529.1 of the Code states:

21           “(a) The use of any controlled substance or the use of any of the dangerous  
22           drugs specified in Section 4022, or of alcoholic beverages, to the extent, or in such  
23           a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to the registrant, or to any other person or  
24           to the public, or to the extent that this use impairs the ability of the registrant to  
25           practice safely or more than one misdemeanor or any felony conviction involving  
26           the use, consumption, or self-administration of any of the substances referred to in  
27           this section, or any combination thereof, constitutes unprofessional conduct. The  
28           record of the conviction is conclusive evidence of this unprofessional conduct.

          “(b) 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 section. The  
          board may order discipline of the registrant in accordance with Section 2227 or  
          may order the denial of the registration 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 imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent  
          order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing this  
          person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or

---

<sup>2</sup> California Business and Professions Code section 2002, as amended and effective January 1, 2008, provides that, unless otherwise expressly provided, the term “board” as used in the State Medical Practice Act (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 2000, *et seq.*) means the “Medical Board of California,” and references to the “Division of Medical Quality” and “Division of Licensing” in the Act or any other provision of law shall be deemed to refer to the Board.

<sup>3</sup> There is a nexus between a physician’s use of alcoholic beverages and his or her fitness to practice medicine, established by the Legislature in section 2239, “in all cases where a licensed physician used alcoholic beverages to the extent or in such a manner as to pose a danger to himself or others.” (*Watson v. Superior Court (Medical Board)* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 1407, 1411.)

1 setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, complaint,  
2 information, or indictment.”

3 18. Section 3576 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

4 “(a) A registration under this chapter may be denied, suspended, revoked,  
5 placed on probation, or otherwise subjected to discipline for any of the following  
6 by the holder:

7 “...

8 “(2) An act of dishonesty or fraud.

9 “(3) Committing any act or being convicted of a crime constituting grounds  
10 for denial of licensure or registration under Section 480.

11 “(4) Violating or attempting to violate this chapter or any regulation adopted  
12 under this chapter.

13 “...”

14 19. Section 480 of the Code states, pertinent part:

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

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

### 28 **COST RECOVERY**

20. Section 125.3 of the Code states:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the Osteopathic Medical Board, 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.

(b) In the case of a disciplined licentiate that is a corporation or a partnership, the order may be made against the licensed corporate entity or licensed partnership.

(c) A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs where actual costs are not available, signed by the entity bringing the proceeding or its designated representative shall be prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case. The costs shall include the amount of investigative and

1 enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not limited to, charges  
2 imposed by the Attorney General.

3 (d) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount of  
4 reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested pursuant to  
5 subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to costs shall not be  
6 reviewable by the board to increase the cost award. The board may reduce or eliminate the  
7 cost award, or remand to the administrative law judge where the proposed decision fails to  
8 make a finding on costs requested pursuant to subdivision (a).

9 (e) Where an order for recovery of costs is made and timely payment is not made as  
10 directed in the board's decision, the board may enforce the order for repayment in any  
11 appropriate court. This right of enforcement shall be in addition to any other rights the  
12 board may have as to any licentiate to pay costs.

13 (f) In any action for recovery of costs, proof of the board's decision shall be  
14 conclusive proof of the validity of the order of payment and the terms for payment.

15 (g)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the board shall not renew or reinstate the  
16 license of any licentiate who has failed to pay all of the costs ordered under this section.

17 (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the board may, in its discretion, conditionally  
18 renew or reinstate for a maximum of one year the license of any licentiate who  
19 demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal agreement with the board to  
20 reimburse the board within that one-year period for the unpaid costs.

21 (h) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement for  
22 costs incurred and shall be deposited in the fund of the board recovering the costs to be  
23 available upon appropriation by the Legislature.

24 (i) Nothing in this section shall preclude a board from including the recovery of the  
25 costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.

26 (j) This section does not apply to any board if a specific statutory provision in that  
27 board's licensing act provides for recovery of costs in an administrative disciplinary  
28 proceeding.

## **BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE VIOLATIONS**

### **Use of Alcoholic Beverages to the Extent, or in a Manner, as to be Dangerous to Respondent, Another Person, or the Public**

21 21. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License  
22 No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2227, 2234, and 3576, as defined by sections 480,  
23 subdivision (a) sub-paragraph (1); and 2239, subdivision (a), of the Code, in that she has used  
24 alcoholic beverages to the extent, or in such a manner, as to be dangerous or injurious to herself,  
25 another person, or the public. The facts and circumstances regarding this allegation are as follows  
26 (Exhibit 6):  
27  
28

1 A. On or about February 27, 2011, at approximately 1:54 a.m., San Ramon Police  
2 Department Officer C.B. was on routine patrol when he observed a black Toyota passenger  
3 vehicle stopped well in front of the crosswalk at a municipal traffic intersection controlled  
4 by traffic control signals in all four directions at one of the busiest intersections in the City  
5 of San Ramon, California.

6 B. Officer C.B. noticed that the black Toyota vehicle was positioned halfway past the  
7 limit line and into the intersection; a violation of California Vehicle Code §21452,  
8 subdivision (a).

9 C. Once the traffic signal light in the direction of travel of the Toyota vehicle turned  
10 green, Officer C.B. observed that the Toyota failed to proceed through the green light and  
11 just remained stopped and idle at the intersection for approximately ten to twelve seconds  
12 before finally proceeding through the intersection; a violation of California Vehicle Code  
13 §21451, subdivision (a).

14 D. After observing these two traffic violations, Officer C.B. activated his patrol vehicle's  
15 overhead emergency lights and conducted a traffic stop of the Toyota vehicle. The Toyota  
16 vehicle yielded to the right of the roadway and Officer C.B. exited his patrol vehicle and  
17 contacted the driver of the Toyota vehicle, identified as the Respondent.

18 E. Officer C.B. advised the Respondent as to the nature and circumstances of the traffic  
19 stop, and requested Respondent's driver's license, which she provided. While interacting  
20 and speaking with Respondent, Officer C.B. observed Respondent displaying objective  
21 signs and symptoms of alcohol intoxication, such as slow deliberate speech, bloodshot  
22 watery eyes, and a distinct odor of alcohol emanating from Respondent's breath.

23 F. When Officer C.B. asked Respondent where she was coming from, she admitted she  
24 was coming from a bar. When asked if she had consumed any alcoholic beverages at the  
25 bar, Respondent told Officer C.B. she had consumed only one martini. Respondent further  
26 explained to Officer C.B. that she was the designated driver and was careful not to consume  
27 more alcoholic beverages.  
28



1 G. Officer C.B. then requested Respondent exit the Toyota vehicle and noticed that  
2 Respondent's eyes displayed a lack of smooth pursuit and had a distinct continuous bounce  
3 at the maximum deviation (angle of onset was at approximately thirty-five degrees),  
4 consistent with a Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus (HGN).

5 H. Officer C.B. asked Respondent a series of preliminary driving while under the  
6 influence (DUI) investigative questions and then requested Respondent perform a series of  
7 field sobriety tests (FST's) to assess her intoxication level and ability to safely operate a  
8 motor vehicle.

9 I. After performing poorly on the FST's, Respondent was administered a preliminary  
10 alcohol screening (PAS) test in which Respondent's two breath samples yielded the results  
11 of 0.134% and 0.129% blood alcohol content (BAC).

12 J. Based on Respondent's objective signs of intoxication, driving, admission of  
13 alcoholic beverage consumption and poor performance on the FST's, Officer C.B. formed  
14 the opinion that she was operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of an alcoholic  
15 beverage.

16 K. Respondent was placed under arrest for violations of California Vehicle Code  
17 §23152, subdivisions (a) and (b), and was transported to the San Ramon Police Department  
18 station where she provided two evidentiary breath samples which yielded BAC levels of  
19 0.11 % and 0.11%. Respondent declined to take an additional blood test for alcohol content.

20 L. On or about May 2, 2011, the Contra Costa County District Attorney filed a criminal  
21 complaint against the Respondent in the matter entitled, *The People of the State of*  
22 *California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No.  
23 153598-8, for violations of California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (a) and (b) in two  
24 separate counts.

25 M. On or about June 20, 2011, Respondent was convicted upon her plea of *nolo*  
26 *contendere* to count two of the criminal complaint in the matter entitled, *The People of the*  
27 *State of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No.  
28 153598-8, i.e. driving a motor vehicle with a blood alcohol content at or above 0.08% in

1 violation of California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (b). Respondent was sentenced  
2 to three years' probation and was subject to various terms and conditions, such as forty  
3 hours of community service in lieu of custody time in jail, first offender alcohol program,  
4 fines and fees.

5 N. On or about February 15, 2020, at approximately 8:49 p.m., Pleasanton Police  
6 Department Officer A.K. was on routine patrol when he was dispatched to the 580  
7 Interstate (I-580) overpass regarding a white vehicle that was stalled or involved in a solo  
8 vehicle collision.

9 O. When Officer A.K. arrived at the I-580 overpass, he observed a white Nissan vehicle  
10 stopped in the southbound direction along the south side of the overpass interstate freeway  
11 with both front wheels facing outward in opposite directions, a broken front axle to the  
12 Nissan vehicle, and that the vehicle was resting along a concrete curb on the interstate  
13 overpass. Officer A.K. also noticed that the passenger side airbags of the Nissan vehicle  
14 had been deployed, that the engine was still running with the vehicle in drive, and the driver  
15 had her foot on the brake pedal.

16 P. Officer A.K. contacted the person positioned in the driver-seat of the Nissan vehicle,  
17 identified as the Respondent, who was the sole occupant of the vehicle, and requested she  
18 turn the vehicle off, which she did.

19 Q. Respondent told Officer A.K. that she was fine and that she had just left work at  
20 Great Clips and was driving to her second job at Sleep Diagnostic in Fremont, California,  
21 when her car suddenly stopped moving for "some reason." Respondent did not recall  
22 colliding with anything and appeared confused as to why her vehicle had stopped moving.  
23 When Officer A.K. informed her that it appeared she had struck the concrete curb on the  
24 interstate overpass with her vehicle with enough force that it caused her airbags to deploy  
25 and her front axle to break, Respondent appeared shocked and in disbelief.

26 R. Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Department arrived at the scene and determined that  
27 Respondent had no immediate medical needs.  
28

1 S. Simultaneously, Sergeant B. of the Pleasanton Police Department, spoke with a  
2 civilian witness, T.M., at the scene who stated that he was stopped at a red light when he  
3 observed the white Nissan vehicle travelling southbound on the 1-580 overpass and  
4 appeared to strike the concrete curb. T.M. stated that he then drove to the stopped Nissan  
5 vehicle to contact the driver. T.M. observed the driver (Respondent) to have slurred speech  
6 and he believed she might be intoxicated. T.M. called emergency 911 and stayed with the  
7 driver (Respondent) until law enforcement arrived.

8 T. During Officer A.K.'s interactions with Respondent he observed the distinct odor of  
9 alcohol emanating from her breath, that Respondent had bloodshot and watery eyes, as well  
10 as very slurred and at times incoherent speech. Based on the totality of circumstances,  
11 Officer A.K. requested Respondent perform Standardized Field Sobriety Tests (SFST's). In  
12 response to Officer A.K.'s request, Respondent adamantly denied drinking any alcoholic  
13 beverages or taking any drugs or medication, but agreed to perform the SFST's.

14 U. As the Respondent exited her vehicle, she was very unsteady on her feet and had to  
15 use her open driver's side car door to assist her to regain her balance. She then walked to  
16 the nearby sidewalk with a slow and staggered gait.

17 V. Officer A.K. administered SFST's with the following results:

- 18 i. HGN – lack of smooth pursuit in both Respondent's eyes with a sustained and  
19 distinct equal horizontal nystagmus in both eyes prior to forty-five degrees and  
20 nystagmus at the maximum deviation;
- 21 ii. Romberg – Respondent estimated the passing of thirty seconds as seven actual  
22 seconds. During the test, Respondent swayed side to side and front to back in a  
23 continuous manner;
- 24 iii. Walk and Turn – Respondent was unable to maintain a balanced stance while  
25 being given instructions for the test. She also had difficulty walking in a straight line  
26 and missed her heel-to-toe on each step. She took only three steps and stopped.  
27 Respondent was asked if she completed the nine steps and she stated she did.

Respondent then turned around without pivoting as instructed to do so and took only four steps before stopping the test;

iv. One Leg Stand – Respondent was too unsteady to safely complete this test;

v. Finger to Nose – Respondent was too unsteady to safely complete this test; and

vi. PAS – Respondent appeared unable to provide a long steady breath into the PAS device that necessitated a manual mode capture of two breaths which yielded 0.174% and 0.162% BAC.

W. Based on Respondent’s objective signs of intoxication, driving, and poor performance on the SFST’s, Officer A.K. formed the opinion that she was operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of an alcoholic beverage.

X. Respondent was placed under arrest for violations of California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (a) and (b), and was transported to a certified phlebotomist who conducted a blood sample withdrawal of Respondent in a medically approved manner, which later yielded the result of 0.19% ethanol.

Y. On or about May 21, 2020, the Alameda County District Attorney filed a criminal complaint against the Respondent in the matter entitled, *The People of the State of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 20-CR-007522, for violations of California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (a) and (b) in two separate counts; with the special allegation of count two in that Respondent’s blood alcohol content was at or above 0.15% in violation of Cal. Vehicle Code §23578. The criminal complaint also alleged Respondent’s prior Contra Costa County 2011 misdemeanor DUI conviction pursuant to Cal. Vehicle Code §23540 and §23546.

Z. On or about February 2, 2021, Respondent was convicted upon her plea of *nolo contendere* to count two of the criminal complaint in the matter entitled, *The People of the State of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 20-CR-007522, i.e. driving a motor vehicle with a blood alcohol content at or above 0.08% in violation of California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (b). Respondent was sentenced to three years’ probation and was subject to various terms and conditions such as two days

1 of custody time in jail, attend and complete an eighteen-month drunk driver multiple  
2 offender program, not to drive a motor vehicle with any measurable amount of alcohol,  
3 fines and fees.

4 **More than One Misdemeanor Conviction Involving the Use of Alcohol**

5 22. Respondent Deanna S. Long has further subjected her Polysomnographic Technician  
6 License No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2227, 2234, and 3576, as defined by sections  
7 480, subdivision (a) sub-paragraph (1); and 2239, subdivision (a), of the Code, in that she has  
8 suffered more than one misdemeanor conviction involving the use of alcohol, as more particularly  
9 alleged hereinafter in paragraph 21, above, and is hereby incorporated by reference and re-alleged  
10 as if fully set forth herein.

11 **Conviction of a Crime Substantially Related to the Qualifications, Functions, or Duties of a**  
12 **Polysomnographic Technician**

13 23. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License  
14 No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2227, 2234 and 3576, as defined by sections 480,  
15 subdivision (a) sub-paragraph (1); and 2236, subdivision (a), of the Code, in that she has been  
16 convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a  
17 polysomnographic technician, as more particularly alleged hereinafter in paragraph 21, above,  
18 and is hereby incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.

19 **Commission of Acts of Dishonesty**

20 24. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License  
21 No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2234 and 3576, as defined by sections 2234 and 3576,  
22 subdivision (a), sub-paragraph (2), in that she made statements containing false, misleading or  
23 deceptive information, as more particularly alleged hereafter:

24 25. On or about March 5, 2021, Respondent was interviewed by an investigator for the  
25 Board. During the interview (Exhibit 7):

26 A. Respondent denied being arrested prior to February 15, 2020, contrary to her arrest on  
27 February 27, 2011;  
28

1 B. Respondent admitted consuming two glasses of wine prior to driving on February 15,  
2 2020, contradicting her previous statements to Officer A.K.; and

3 C. Respondent claimed she “fell asleep at wheel” on February 15, 2020, despite no  
4 evidence to suggest Respondent was asleep at the time and contrary to Respondent’s  
5 statements to Officer A.K.

6 26. Paragraph 21, above, is hereby incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set  
7 forth herein.

8 **General Unprofessional Conduct**

9 27. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License  
10 No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2234, in that she has committed acts or engaged in  
11 conduct which breaches the rules or ethical code of the medical profession, or conduct which is  
12 unbecoming to a member in good standing of the medical profession, and which demonstrates an  
13 unfitness as a polysomnographic technician.<sup>4</sup> The totality of the circumstances surrounding the  
14 conduct are described in paragraphs 21 through 26 above, which are incorporated by reference  
15 and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.

16 **DETERMINATION OF ISSUES**

17 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected  
18 her Polysomnographic Technician License No. PTCN 340 to discipline.

19 2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

20 3. Pursuant to its authority under California Government Code section 11520, and on  
21 the evidence before it, the Medical Board of California hereby finds that the charges and  
22 allegations contained in the Accusation Case No. 800-2020-064962, and the Findings of Fact  
23 contained in paragraphs 1 through 27, above, are true and correct.

24 4. Pursuant to its authority under California Government Code section 11520, and by  
25 reason of the Findings of Fact contained in paragraphs 1 through 27, above, and the  
26 Determination of Issues 1, 2, and 3 above, the Medical Board of California hereby finds that  
27 Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License No. PTCN

28 <sup>4</sup> *Shea v. Board of Medical Examiners* (1978) 81 Cal.App.3d 564, 575.

1 340 to discipline under sections 2234, 3576, 2236, subdivision (a), 2239, subdivision (a), and 480  
2 subdivision (a), sub-paragraph (1), of the Code, in that she has:

3 (a) Used alcoholic beverages to the extent, or in a manner, as to be dangerous to  
4 Respondent, another person, or the public, referenced above, in that she was arrested on or about  
5 February 27, 2011 and thereafter convicted of violating California Vehicle Code §23152,  
6 subdivision (b) on or about June 20, 2011 in the case entitled *The People of the State of*  
7 *California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. 153598-8;

8 (b) Used alcoholic beverages to the extent, or in a manner, as to be dangerous to  
9 Respondent, another person, or the public, referenced above, in that she was arrested on or about  
10 February 15, 2020 and thereafter convicted of violating California Vehicle Code §23152,  
11 subdivision (b) on or about February 2, 2021 in the case entitled *The People of the State of*  
12 *California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 20-CR-007522;

13 (c) Been convicted of more than one misdemeanor involving the use of alcohol,  
14 referenced above, in that she was convicted of violating California Vehicle Code §23152,  
15 subdivisions (b) on two separate occasions on or about June 20, 2011 in the case entitled *The*  
16 *People of the State of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Contra Costa County Superior Court  
17 Case No. 153598-8, and again on or about February 2, 2021 in the case entitled *The People of the*  
18 *State of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 20-CR-  
19 007522;

20 (d) Been convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or  
21 duties of a polysomnographic technician, referenced above, in that she was convicted of violating  
22 California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivision (b) on two separate occasions on or about June 20,  
23 2011 in the case entitled *The People of the State of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Contra  
24 Costa County Superior Court Case No. 153598-8, and again on or about February 2, 2021 in the  
25 case entitled *The People of the State of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Alameda County  
26 Superior Court Case No. 20-CR-007522;

27 (e) Made statements containing false, misleading or deceptive information, as referenced  
28 above, during her interview with the investigator for the Board on or about March 5, 2021, insofar

1 as she denied being arrested prior to February 15, 2020, admitted to consuming two glasses of  
2 wine prior to driving on February 15, 2020, and claimed she “fell asleep at wheel” on February  
3 15, 2020, despite all other evidence presented by law enforcement to the contrary; and

4 (f) Committed unprofessional conduct, referenced above, in that she was arrested and  
5 convicted of violating California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (b) on two separate  
6 occasions on or about June 20, 2011 in the case entitled *The People of the State of California v.*  
7 *Deanna Summer Long*, Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. 153598-8, and again on or  
8 about February 2, 2021 in the case entitled *The People of the State of California v. Deanna*  
9 *Summer Long*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 20-CR-007522.

10 5. The Medical Board of California is authorized to revoke Respondent’s  
11 Polysomnographic Technician License based upon Findings of Fact 1 through 27 and  
12 Determination of Issues 1 through 5.

13 6. Revocation is the appropriate discipline based on Determination of Issues 1 through  
14 5.

15 7. Respondent is liable to the Board the costs of investigation and enforcement, in the  
16 total amount of \$13,566.25.

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

If Respondent ever files an application for relicensure or reinstatement in the State of California, the Board shall treat it as a petition for reinstatement of a revoked license. Respondent must comply with all laws, regulations, and procedures for reinstatement of a revoked license in effect at the time the petition for reinstatement is filed.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

It is so ORDERED August 25, 2021

Attachment: Default Decision Evidence Packet

17

1 ROB BONTA  
Attorney General of California  
2 STEVEN D. MUNI  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
3 AARON L. LENT  
Deputy Attorney General  
4 State Bar No. 256857  
1300 I Street, Suite 125  
5 P.O. Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550  
6 Telephone: (916) 210-7545  
Facsimile: (916) 327-2247  
7

8 *Attorneys for Complainant*

9  
10 **BEFORE THE**  
**MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**  
12 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

13 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 800-2020-064962

14 **Deanna S. Long**  
3384 La Canada Dr., Apt. 1  
15 **Cameron Park, CA 95682-7982**

**A C C U S A T I O N**

16 **Polysomnographic Technician License**  
17 **No. PTCN 340**

Respondent.

18  
19  
20 **PARTIES**

21 1. William Prasifka (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity  
22 as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs  
23 (Board).

24 2. On or about January 31, 2013, the Medical Board issued Polysomnographic  
25 Technician License No. PTCN 340 to Deanna S. Long (Respondent). The Polysomnographic  
26 Technician License expired on January 31, 2021, and has not been renewed.

27 ///

28 ///

## JURISDICTION

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

4. Section 2227 of the Code states:

“(a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or who has entered into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter:

“(1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the board.

“(2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a period not to exceed one year upon order of the board.

“(3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation monitoring upon order of the board.

“(4) Be publicly reprimanded by the board. The public reprimand may include a requirement that the licensee complete relevant educational courses approved by the board.

“(5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as part of an order of probation, as the board or an administrative law judge may deem proper.

“(b) Any matter heard pursuant to subdivision (a), except for warning letters, medical review or advisory conferences, professional competency examinations, continuing education activities, and cost reimbursement associated therewith that are agreed to with the board and successfully completed by the licensee, or other matters made confidential or privileged by existing law, is deemed public, and shall be made available to the public by the board pursuant to Section 803.1.”

///

///

1           5.     Section 2234 of the Code, states, in pertinent part:

2                 “The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with  
3                 unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article,  
4                 unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

5                 “(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or  
6                 abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.  
7                 [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act].

8                 “...

9                 “(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption that is  
10                 substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and  
11                 surgeon.

12                 “(f) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a  
13                 certificate.

14                 “...”

15           6.     Section 2236 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

16                 “(a) The conviction of any offense substantially related to the qualifications,  
17                 functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon constitutes unprofessional conduct  
18                 within the meaning of this chapter [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act]. The  
19                 record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the  
20                 conviction occurred.

21                 “...

22                 “(d) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction after a plea of nolo  
23                 contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section and  
24                 Section 2236.1. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence of the fact  
25                 that the conviction occurred.”

26           7.     Section 2239 of the Code states:

27                 “(a) The use or prescribing for or administering to himself or herself, of any  
28                 controlled substance; or the use of any of the dangerous drugs specified in Section

1 4022, or of alcoholic beverages, to the extent, or in such a manner as to be  
2 dangerous or injurious to the licensee, or to any other person or to the public, or to  
3 the extent that such use impairs the ability of the licensee to practice medicine  
4 safely or more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use,  
5 consumption, or self-administration of any of the substances referred to in this  
6 section, or any combination thereof, constitutes unprofessional conduct. The  
7 record of the conviction is conclusive evidence of such unprofessional conduct.

8 “(b) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo  
9 contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section. The  
10 Division of Medical Quality<sup>1</sup> may order discipline of the licensee in accordance  
11 with Section 2227 or the Division of Licensing may order the denial of the license  
12 when the time for appeal has elapsed or the judgment of conviction has been  
13 affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending  
14 imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of  
15 Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing such person to withdraw his or her  
16 plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of  
17 guilty, or dismissing the accusation, complaint, information, or indictment.”<sup>2</sup>

18 8. Section 2529.1 of the Code states:

19 “(a) The use of any controlled substance or the use of any of the dangerous  
20 drugs specified in Section 4022, or of alcoholic beverages, to the extent, or in such  
21 a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to the registrant, or to any other person or  
22 to the public, or to the extent that this use impairs the ability of the registrant to

23  
24 <sup>1</sup> California Business and Professions Code section 2002, as amended and effective January 1,  
25 2008, provides that, unless otherwise expressly provided, the term “board” as used in the State Medical  
26 Practice Act (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 2000, *et seq.*) means the “Medical Board of California,” and  
references to the “Division of Medical Quality” and “Division of Licensing” in the Act or any other  
provision of law shall be deemed to refer to the Board.

27 <sup>2</sup> There is a nexus between a physician’s use of alcoholic beverages and his or her fitness to  
28 practice medicine, established by the Legislature in section 2239, “in all cases where a licensed physician  
used alcoholic beverages to the extent or in such a manner as to pose a danger to himself or others.”  
(*Watson v. Superior Court (Medical Board)* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 1407, 1411.)

1 practice safely or more than one misdemeanor or any felony conviction involving  
2 the use, consumption, or self-administration of any of the substances referred to in  
3 this section, or any combination thereof, constitutes unprofessional conduct. The  
4 record of the conviction is conclusive evidence of this unprofessional conduct.

5 “(b) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo  
6 contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section. The  
7 board may order discipline of the registrant in accordance with Section 2227 or  
8 may order the denial of the registration when the time for appeal has elapsed or the  
9 judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting  
10 probation is made suspending imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent  
11 order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing this  
12 person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or  
13 setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, complaint,  
14 information, or indictment.”

15 9. Section 3576 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

16 “(a) A registration under this chapter may be denied, suspended, revoked,  
17 placed on probation, or otherwise subjected to discipline for any of the following  
18 by the holder:

19 “...

20 “(2) An act of dishonesty or fraud.

21 “(3) Committing any act or being convicted of a crime constituting grounds  
22 for denial of licensure or registration under Section 480.

23 “(4) Violating or attempting to violate this chapter or any regulation adopted  
24 under this chapter.

25 “...”

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

27 “(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this code, a board may deny a  
28 license regulated by this code on the grounds that the applicant has been

1 convicted of a crime or has been subject to formal discipline only if either of the  
2 following conditions are met:

3 “(1) The applicant has been convicted of a crime within the preceding seven  
4 years from the date of application that is substantially related to the qualifications,  
5 functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the application is made,  
6 regardless of whether the applicant was incarcerated for that crime, or the applicant  
7 has been convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications,  
8 functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the application is made  
9 and for which the applicant is presently incarcerated or for which the applicant was  
10 released from incarceration within the preceding seven years from the date of  
11 application...”

12 11. Section 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides that the suspension/expiraton/  
13 surrender/cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board/Registrar/Director of jurisdiction to  
14 proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed,  
15 restored, reissued or reinstated.

### 16 **COST RECOVERY**

17 12. Section 125.3 of the Code states:

18 (a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a  
19 disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the  
20 Osteopathic Medical Board, the board may request the administrative law judge to  
21 direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing  
22 act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and  
23 enforcement of the case.

24 (b) In the case of a disciplined licentiate that is a corporation or a partnership,  
25 the order may be made against the licensed corporate entity or licensed partnership.

26 (c) A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs where  
27 actual costs are not available, signed by the entity bringing the proceeding or its  
28 designated representative shall be prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of

1 investigation and prosecution of the case. The costs shall include the amount of  
2 investigative and enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not  
3 limited to, charges imposed by the Attorney General.

4 (d) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount  
5 of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested  
6 pursuant to subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to  
7 costs shall not be reviewable by the board to increase the cost award. The board may  
8 reduce or eliminate the cost award, or remand to the administrative law judge where  
9 the proposed decision fails to make a finding on costs requested pursuant to  
10 subdivision (a).

11 (e) Where an order for recovery of costs is made and timely payment is not  
12 made as directed in the board's decision, the board may enforce the order for  
13 repayment in any appropriate court. This right of enforcement shall be in addition to  
14 any other rights the board may have as to any licensee to pay costs.

15 (f) In any action for recovery of costs, proof of the board's decision shall be  
16 conclusive proof of the validity of the order of payment and the terms for payment.

17 (g)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the board shall not renew or  
18 reinstate the license of any licensee who has failed to pay all of the costs ordered  
19 under this section.

20 (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the board may, in its discretion,  
21 conditionally renew or reinstate for a maximum of one year the license of any  
22 licensee who demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal  
23 agreement with the board to reimburse the board within that one-year period for the  
24 unpaid costs.

25 (h) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement  
26 for costs incurred and shall be deposited in the fund of the board recovering the costs  
27 to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature.

28 (i) Nothing in this section shall preclude a board from including the recovery



1 of the costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.

2 (j) This section does not apply to any board if a specific statutory provision in that  
3 board's licensing act provides for recovery of costs in an administrative  
4 disciplinary proceeding.

5 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

6 **(Use of Alcoholic Beverages to the Extent, or in a Manner, as to be Dangerous to**  
7 **Respondent, Another Person, or the Public)**

8 13. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License  
9 No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2227, 2234, and 3576, as defined by sections 480,  
10 subdivision (a) sub-paragraph (1); and 2239, subdivision (a), of the Code, in that she has used  
11 alcoholic beverages to the extent, or in such a manner, as to be dangerous or injurious to herself,  
12 another person, or the public, as more particularly alleged hereinafter:

13 **June 20, 2011 Conviction of Cal. Vehicle Code §23152(b)**

14 14. On or about February 27, 2011, at approximately 1:54 a.m., San Ramon Police  
15 Department Officer C.B. was on routine patrol when he observed a black Toyota passenger  
16 vehicle stopped well in front of the crosswalk at a municipal traffic intersection controlled by  
17 traffic control signals in all four directions at one of the busiest intersections in the City of San  
18 Ramon, California.

19 15. Officer C.B. noticed that the black Toyota vehicle was positioned halfway past the  
20 limit line and into the intersection; a violation of California Vehicle Code §21452, subdivision  
21 (a).

22 16. Once the traffic signal light in the direction of travel of the Toyota vehicle turned  
23 green, Officer C.B. observed that the Toyota failed to proceed through the green light and just  
24 remained stopped and idle at the intersection for approximately ten to twelve seconds before  
25 finally proceeding through the intersection; a violation of California Vehicle Code §21451,  
26 subdivision (a).

27 17. After observing these two traffic violations, Officer C.B. activated his patrol vehicle's  
28 overhead emergency lights and conducted a traffic stop of the Toyota vehicle. The Toyota vehicle

1 yielded to the right of the roadway and Officer C.B. exited his patrol vehicle and contacted the  
2 driver of the Toyota vehicle, identified as the Respondent.

3 18. Officer C.B. advised the Respondent as to the nature and circumstances of the traffic  
4 stop, and requested Respondent's driver's license, which she provided. While interacting and  
5 speaking with Respondent, Officer C.B. observed Respondent displaying objective signs and  
6 symptoms of alcohol intoxication, such as slow deliberate speech, bloodshot watery eyes, and a  
7 distinct odor of alcohol emanating from Respondent's breath.

8 19. When Officer C.B. asked Respondent where she was coming from, she admitted she  
9 was coming from a bar. When asked if she had consumed any alcoholic beverages at the bar,  
10 Respondent told Officer C.B. she had consumed only one martini. Respondent further explained  
11 to Officer C.B. that she was the designated driver and was careful not to consume more alcoholic  
12 beverages.

13 20. Officer C.B. then requested Respondent exit the Toyota vehicle and noticed that  
14 Respondent's eyes displayed a lack of smooth pursuit and had a distinct continuous bounce at the  
15 maximum deviation (angle of onset was at approximately thirty-five degrees), consistent with a  
16 Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus (HGN).

17 21. Officer C.B. asked Respondent a series of preliminary driving while under the  
18 influence (DUI) investigative questions and then requested Respondent perform a series of field  
19 sobriety tests (FST's) to assess her intoxication level and ability to safely operate a motor vehicle.

20 22. After performing poorly on the FST's, Respondent was administered a preliminary  
21 alcohol screening (PAS) test in which Respondent's two breath samples yielded the results of  
22 0.134% and 0.129% blood alcohol content (BAC).

23 23. Based on Respondent's objective signs of intoxication, driving, admission of  
24 alcoholic beverage consumption and poor performance on the FST's, Officer C.B. formed the  
25 opinion that she was operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of an alcoholic  
26 beverage.

27 24. Respondent was placed under arrest for violations of California Vehicle Code  
28 §23152, subdivisions (a) and (b), and was transported to the San Ramon Police Department

1 station where she provided two evidentiary breath samples which yielded BAC levels of 0.11%  
2 and 0.11%. Respondent declined to take an additional blood test for alcohol content.

3 25. On or about May 2, 2011, the Contra Costa County District Attorney filed a criminal  
4 complaint against the Respondent in the matter entitled, *The People of the State of California v.*  
5 *Deanna Summer Long*, Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. 153598-8, for violations of  
6 California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (a) and (b) in two separate counts.

7 26. On or about June 20, 2011, Respondent was convicted upon her plea of *nolo*  
8 *contendere* to count two of the criminal complaint in the matter entitled, *The People of the State*  
9 *of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. 153598-8,  
10 i.e. driving a motor vehicle with a blood alcohol content at or above 0.08% in violation of  
11 California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (b). Respondent was sentenced to three years'  
12 probation and was subject to various terms and conditions, such as forty hours of community  
13 service in lieu of custody time in jail, first offender alcohol program, fines and fees.

14 **February 2, 2021 Conviction of Cal. Vehicle Code §23152(b)**

15 27. On or about February 15, 2020, at approximately 8:49 p.m., Pleasanton Police  
16 Department Officer A.K. was on routine patrol when he was dispatched to the 580 Interstate (I-  
17 580) overpass regarding a white vehicle that was stalled or involved in a solo vehicle collision.

18 28. When Officer A.K. arrived at the I-580 overpass, he observed a white Nissan vehicle  
19 stopped in the southbound direction along the south side of the overpass interstate freeway with  
20 both front wheels facing outward in opposite directions, a broken front axle to the Nissan vehicle,  
21 and that the vehicle was resting along a concrete curb on the interstate overpass. Officer A.K. also  
22 noticed that the passenger side airbags of the Nissan vehicle had been deployed, that the engine  
23 was still running with the vehicle in drive, and the driver had her foot on the brake pedal.

24 29. Officer A.K. contacted the person positioned in the driver-seat of the Nissan vehicle,  
25 identified as the Respondent, who was the sole occupant of the vehicle, and requested she turn the  
26 vehicle off, which she did.

27 30. Respondent told Officer A.K. that she was fine and that she had just left work at  
28 Great Clips and was driving to her second job at Sleep Diagnostic in Fremont, California, when

1 her car suddenly stopped moving for "some reason." Respondent did not recall colliding with  
2 anything and appeared confused as to why her vehicle had stopped moving. When Officer A.K.  
3 informed her that it appeared she had struck the concrete curb on the interstate overpass with her  
4 vehicle with enough force that it caused her airbags to deploy and her front axle to break,  
5 Respondent appeared shocked and in disbelief.

6 31. Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Department arrived at the scene and determined that  
7 Respondent had no immediate medical needs.

8 32. Simultaneously, Sergeant B. of Pleasanton Police Department, spoke with a civilian  
9 witness, T.M., at the scene who stated that he was stopped at a red light when he observed the  
10 white Nissan vehicle travelling southbound on the I-580 overpass and appeared to strike the  
11 concrete curb. T.M. stated that he then drove to the stopped Nissan vehicle to contact the driver.  
12 T.M. observed the driver (Respondent) to have slurred speech and he believed she might be  
13 intoxicated. T.M. called emergency 911 and stayed with the driver (Respondent) until law  
14 enforcement arrived.

15 33. During Officer A.K.'s interactions with Respondent he observed the distinct odor of  
16 alcohol emanating from her breath, that Respondent had bloodshot and watery eyes, as well as  
17 very slurred and at times incoherent speech. Based on the totality of circumstances, Officer A.K.  
18 requested Respondent perform Standardized Field Sobriety Tests (SFST's). In response to Officer  
19 A.K.'s request, Respondent adamantly denied drinking any alcoholic beverages or taking any  
20 drugs or medication, but agreed to perform the SFST's.

21 34. As the Respondent exited her vehicle, she was very unsteady on her feet and had to  
22 use her open driver's side car door to assist her to regain her balance. She then walked to the  
23 nearby sidewalk with a slow and staggered gait.

24 35. Officer A.K. administered SFST's with the following results:

25 A. HGN – lack of smooth pursuit in both Respondent's eyes with a sustained and  
26 distinct equal horizontal nystagmus in both eyes prior to forty-five degrees and nystagmus  
27 at the maximum deviation;  
28

1 B. Romberg – Respondent estimated the passing of thirty seconds as seven actual  
2 seconds. During the test, Respondent swayed side to side and front to back in a continuous  
3 manner;

4 C. Walk and Turn – Respondent was unable to maintain a balanced stance while  
5 being given instructions for the test. She also had difficulty walking in a straight line and  
6 missed her heel-to-toe on each step. She took only three steps and stopped. Respondent was  
7 asked if she completed the nine steps and she stated she did. Respondent then turned around  
8 without pivoting as instructed to do so and took only four steps before stopping the test;

9 D. One Leg Stand – Respondent was too unsteady to safely complete this test;

10 E. Finger to Nose – Respondent was too unsteady to safely complete this test; and

11 F PAS – Respondent appeared unable to provide a long steady breath into the  
12 PAS device that necessitated a manual mode capture of two breaths which yielded 0.174%  
13 and 0.162% BAC.

14 36. Based on Respondent's objective signs of intoxication, driving, and poor performance  
15 on the SFST's, Officer A.K. formed the opinion that she was operating a motor vehicle while  
16 under the influence of an alcoholic beverage.

17 37. Respondent was placed under arrest for violations of California Vehicle Code  
18 §23152, subdivisions (a) and (b), and was transported to a certified phlebotomist who conducted a  
19 blood sample withdrawal of Respondent in a medically approved manner, which later yielded the  
20 result of 0.19% ethanol.

21 38. On or about May 21, 2020, the Alameda County District Attorney filed a criminal  
22 complaint against the Respondent in the matter entitled, *The People of the State of California v.*  
23 *Deanna Summer Long*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 20-CR-007522, for violations  
24 of California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (a) and (b) in two separate counts; with the  
25 special allegation of count two in that Respondent's blood alcohol content was at or above 0.15%  
26 in violation of Cal. Vehicle Code §23578. The criminal complaint also alleged Respondent's prior  
27 Contra Costa County 2011 misdemeanor DUI conviction pursuant to Cal. Vehicle Code §23540  
28 and §23546.

39. On or about February 2, 2021, Respondent was convicted upon her plea of *nolo contendere* to count two of the criminal complaint in the matter entitled, *The People of the State of California v. Deanna Summer Long*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 20-CR-007522, i.e. driving a motor vehicle with a blood alcohol content at or above 0.08% in violation of California Vehicle Code §23152, subdivisions (b). Respondent was sentenced to three years' probation and was subject to various terms and conditions such as two days of custody time in jail, attend and complete an eighteen-month drunk driver multiple offender program, not to drive a motor vehicle with any measurable amount of alcohol, fines and fees.

## SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

**(More than One Misdemeanor Conviction Involving the Use of Alcohol)**

40. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2227, 2234, and 3576, as defined by sections 480, subdivision (a) sub-paragraph (1); and 2239, subdivision (a), of the Code, in that she has suffered more than one misdemeanor conviction involving the use of alcohol, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 13 through 39, above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Conviction of a Crime Substantially Related to the Qualifications, Functions, or Duties of a Polysomnographic Technician)

41. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2227, 2234 and 3576, as defined by sections 480, subdivision (a) sub-paragraph (1); and 2236, subdivision (a), of the Code, in that she has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a polysomnographic technician, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 13 through 39, above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

///

///

///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Commission of Acts of Dishonesty)**

3 42. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License  
4 No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2234 and 3576, as defined by sections 2234 and 3576,  
5 subdivision (a), sub-paragraph (2), in that she made statements containing false, misleading or  
6 deceptive information, as more particularly alleged hereafter:

7 43. On or about March 5, 2021, Respondent was interviewed by an investigator for the  
8 Board. During the interview:

9 A. Respondent denied being arrested prior to February 15, 2020, contrary to her  
10 arrest on February 27, 2011;

11 B. Respondent admitted consuming two glasses of wine prior to driving on  
12 February 15, 2020, contradicting her previous statements to Officer A.K.; and

13 C. Respondent claimed she “fell asleep at wheel” on February 15, 2020, despite no  
14 evidence to suggest Respondent was asleep at the time and contrary to Respondent’s  
15 statements to Officer A.K.

16 44. Complainant realleges paragraphs 13 through 39, and those paragraphs are  
17 incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

18 **FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

19 **(General Unprofessional Conduct)**

20 45. Respondent Deanna S. Long has subjected her Polysomnographic Technician License  
21 No. PTCN 340 to disciplinary action under 2234, as defined by section 2234, in that she has  
22 committed acts or engaged in conduct which breaches the rules or ethical code of the medical  
23 profession, or conduct which is unbecoming to a member in good standing of the medical  
24 profession, and which demonstrates an unfitness as a polysomnographic technician. The totality  
25 of the circumstances surrounding the conduct are described in paragraphs 13 through 44 above,  
26 which is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

27 ///

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

## PRAYER

3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

WILLIAM PRASIEKA  
Executive Director  
Medical Board of California  
Department of Consumer Affairs  
State of California  
*Complainant*

15