BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Alexis Paula Rojas, PTCN

Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. PTCN 1176

Respondent.

DECISION

The attached Default Decision and Order is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on August 21, 2024. IT IS SO ORDERED July 22, 2024.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 800-2022-089556

Reji Varghese Executive Director

-			
1	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California MICHAEL C. BRUMMEL Supervising Deputy Attorney General JOHN S. GATSCHET Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 244388 California Department of Justice 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7546		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	Facsimile: (916) 327-2247		
8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9			
10	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
11			
12	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
13			
14	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2022-089556	
15	ALEXIS PAULA ROJAS, PTCN	DEFAULT DECISION	
16	4777 Grouse Run Dr. Apt. 164 Stockton, CA 95207-5380	AND ORDER	
17	Polysomnographic Technologist License	[Gov. Code, §11520]	
18	No. PTCN 1176		
19	Respondent.		
20		•	
21			
22	FINDINGS OF FACT		
23	1. On or about February 29, 2024, Complainant Reji Varghese, in his official capacity as		
24	the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs		
25	("Board"), filed Accusation No. 800-2022-089556 against Alexis Paula Rojas, PTCN		
26	("Respondent") before the Medical Board of California.		
27	2. On or about May 28, 2020, the Board issued Polysomnographic Technologist License		
28	No. PTCN 1176 to Respondent. The Polysomnographic Technologist License expired on May		
		1	

(ALEXIS PAULA ROJAS, PTCN) DEFAULT DECISION & ORDER (800-2022-089556)

31, 2022, and has not been renewed. A copy of the Certificate of Licensure is attached as **Exhibit** F.

3. On or about February 29, 2024, Samuel Guardado, an employee of the Complainant Agency, served by Certified and First Class Mail a copy of the Accusation No. 800-2022-089556, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is:

4777 Grouse Run Dr. Apt. 164 Stockton, CA 95207-5380.

A copy of the Accusation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as **Exhibit A**, and are incorporated herein by reference.

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
- 5. On or about March 18, 2024, the aforementioned documents were returned by the U.S. Postal Service marked "Return to Sender, Unable to Forward." A copy of the envelope returned by the post office to the Board is attached as **Exhibit B**, and is incorporated herein by reference.

On or about March 20, 2024, Logan Blaylock, an employee of the Department of Justice, served by Certified and First Class Mail a Courtesy Notice of Default, including a copy of the February 29, 2024 Accusation and accompanying documents, to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is:

4777 Grouse Run Dr. Apt. 164 Stockton, CA 95207-5380.

A copy of the Courtesy Notice of Default, including the accompanying documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as **Exhibit E**, and incorporated herein by reference. On April 15, 2024 the Department of Justice received the Courtesy Notice of Default packet previously served by Certified Mail from the Post Office. The Post Office documented the following: "Return to Sender, Unable to Forward" and returned the Courtesy Default packet. A

copy of the return envelopes for the Courtesy Notice of Default are included in **Exhibit C** and **Exhibit D**, both the copy sent by regular mail and the copy sent by certified mail.

- 6. Business and Professions Code section 118 states, in pertinent part:
- (b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the license on any such ground.
- 7. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
- (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.

Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of the Accusation, and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 800-2022-089556. Respondent's failure to file a Notice of Defense is further set forth in **Exhibit G**, Declaration of DAG John S. Gatschet.

- 8. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
- (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.
- 9. Business and Professions Code section 125.3 states, in pertinent part:
- (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, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the administrative law judge may direct a licensee 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.
- 10. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on Respondent's express admissions by way of default and the evidence before it, contained in

Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I, finds that the allegations in Accusation No. 800-2022-089556 are true.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Alexis Paula Rojas, PTCN has subjected her Polysomnographic Technologist License No. PTCN 1176 to discipline.
- 2. A copy of the Accusation and the related documents and Declaration of Service are attached here as Exhibit A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I.
 - 3. The Board has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 4. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3, the Board is authorized to order Respondent to pay the Board the reasonable costs of investigation and enforcement of the case prayed for in the Accusation total \$ 8,819.75 based on the Certification of Costs attached as Exhibit H in the Exhibit Package.
- 5. The Medical Board of California is authorized to revoke Respondent's Polysomnographic Technologist License based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation:
- On November 20, 2021, at approximately 1:00 a.m., two California Highway Patrol Officers ("Officers") received a broadcast of a collision occurring on southbound Interstate 5 in Stockton, California. The Officers responded to the site of the collision at 1:28 a.m. The Officers observed a silver 2017 Chevrolet Cruze ("Cruze") parked on the west shoulder of Interstate 5 and Respondent standing outside the vehicle. Respondent identified herself as the driver and sole occupant of the Cruze. Respondent stated that she was unsure, but thought she might have hit the rear of a semi-truck while driving. The Officers observed that the Cruze had suffered damage to the hood of the vehicle consistent with colliding with the rear of a semi-truck trailer. The airbags in the Cruze were deployed. The semi-truck trailer was not on scene when the officers arrived and there was no evidence to assist in identifying the trailer that Respondent had hit.
- 7 The Officers observed that Respondent's eyes were red and watery, her speech was slurred, and there was an odor of an alcoholic beverage on her breath and person. As Respondent had self-admitted that she had hit the back of a semi-truck trailer while operating a vehicle, the

Officers performed a driving under the influence investigation. Respondent stated she had one hard seltzer at 7:00 p.m. before law enforcement made contact with her. The Officers had Respondent perform field sobriety tests as part of their investigation. During the Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus test, the Officers observed a lack of smooth pursuit with distinct sustained nystagmus at maximum deviation, and an early on-set of sustained nystagmus. During the One Leg Stand test, the Officers observed Respondent pick up her left foot up and set it down four times during the test and that she held her arms out more than six inches from her sides. During the Walk and Turn test, Respondent used her arms for balance, stepped off the line, and on the turn, Respondent incorrectly turned 90 degrees and started walking towards the lanes of traffic. The Officers stopped the test to prevent Respondent from walking out into traffic. Finally, Respondent declined to take a preliminary alcohol screening device test. The Officers placed Respondent under arrest for driving under the influence.

- 8 Pursuant to implied consent law, Respondent opted to take a breath alcohol test. At approximately 2:00 a.m., Respondent provided a blood alcohol content sample of .12% and .11%. On January 28, 2022, the San Joaquin County District Attorney's Office filed a misdemeanor criminal complaint in *The People of the State of California vs. Alexis Paula Rojas*, Case No. STK-CR-MDUI-2022-0001110. The complaint alleged that Respondent operated a motor vehicle on or about November 20, 2021, while under the influence of alcohol in violation of misdemeanor Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivisions (a) and (b). On June 27, 2022, Respondent pled no contest to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code 23152, subdivision (b), in the above-entitled criminal case. That same day, Respondent was sentenced to three years' informal probation, ordered to obey all laws, ordered to serve two days in custody with custody for time served, pay fines and fees, and ordered to complete a 3-month DMV approved alcohol program. A copy of the certified conviction documents are attached as **Exhibit I**.
- On August 30, 2023, a Board investigator interviewed Respondent. Respondent stated she consumed six hard seltzers and three shots of tequila at a friend's house before driving on November 20, 2021. Respondent stated she began drinking at 6:00 p.m. on November 19, 2021, and stopped drinking at 10:30 pm on November 19, 2021.

1	Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a		
2	written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on		
3	within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The Board in its discretion		
4	may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the		
5	statute.		
6	This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on August 21, 2024.		
7			
8	It is so ORDERED July 22, 2024.		
9	·		
10	alle de for		
11	REJI VARGHESE		
12	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR THE MEDICAL BOARD OF		
13	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
14			
15	SA2023305313 38007806.docx		
16	300700010001		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
2627			
28			
40	7		

(ALEXIS PAULA ROJAS, PTCN) DEFAULT DECISION & ORDER (800-2022-089556)

	ł	
Rob Bonta		
Attorney General of California		
Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
Deputy Attorney General		
California Department of Justice		
P.O. Box 944255		
Telephone: (916) 210-7546 Facsimile: (916) 327-2247		
Attorneys for Complainant		
BEFORE THE		
MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2022-089556	
Alexis P. Rojas	ACCUSATION	
Stockton, CA 95207-5380		
Polysomnographic Technician License No. PTCN 1176,		
Respondent.		
DADOVIDO		
PARTIES 1. Ball Variables ("Complement") beings this Acquestion solely in his official canasity		
as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs		
· .		
Polysomnographic Technologist License expired on May 31, 2022. Respondent has failed to pay		
her registration renewal fee, the license is delinquent, and no practice is permitted at this time.		
ł?	EXIS P. ROJAS) ACCUSATION NO. 800-2022-089556	
	Attorney General of California ALEXANDRA M. ALVAREZ Supervising Deputy Attorney General JOHN S. GATSCHET Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 244388 California Department of Justice 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7546 Facsimile: (916) 327-2247 Attorneys for Complainant BEFORI MEDICAL BOARD DEPARTMENT OF CO STATE OF CA In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Alexis P. Rojas 4777 Grouse Run Dr. Apt. 164 Stockton, CA 95207-5380 Polysomnographic Technician License No. PTCN 1176, Respondent. PART 1. Reji Varghese ("Complainant") bring as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of ("Board"). 2. On or about May 28, 2020, the Medic Technologist License No. PTCN 1176 to Alexis I Polysomnographic Technologist License expired her registration renewal fee, the license is delinquent	

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 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 5. Section 2227 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his or her license revoked, suspended for a period not to exceed one year, placed on probation and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or such other action taken in relation to discipline as the Board deems proper.
 - 6. Section 3576 of the Code states, in pertinent part:
 - (a) A registration under this chapter may be denied, suspended, revoked, placed on probation, or otherwise subjected to discipline for any of the following by the holder:
 - (3) Committing any act or being convicted of a crime constituting grounds for denial of licensure or registration under Section 480.
 - (4) Violating or attempting to violate this chapter or any regulation adopted under this chapter.
 - (b) Proceedings under this section shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, and the board shall have all powers granted therein.
 - 7. Section 2529.1 of the Code states:
 - (a) The use of any controlled substance or the use of any of the dangerous drugs specified in Section 4022, or of alcoholic beverages, to the extent, or in such a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to the registrant, or to any other person or to the public, or to the extent that this use impairs the ability of the registrant to practice safely or more than one misdemeanor or any felony conviction involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any of the substances referred to in this section, or any combination thereof, constitutes unprofessional conduct. The 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 setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, complaint, information, or indictment.

8. Section 2234 of the Code, states:

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

- (a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.
 - (f) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a certificate.

9. Section 2236 of the Code states:

- (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.
- (b) The district attorney, city attorney, or other prosecuting agency shall notify the Medical Board of the pendency of an action against a licensee charging a felony or misdemeanor immediately upon obtaining information that the defendant is a licensee. The notice shall identify the licensee and describe the crimes charged and the facts alleged. The prosecuting agency shall also notify the clerk of the court in which the action is pending that the defendant is a licensee, and the clerk shall record prominently in the file that the defendant holds a license as a physician and surgeon.
- (c) The clerk of the court in which a licensee is convicted of a crime shall, within 48 hours after the conviction, transmit a certified copy of the record of conviction to the board. The division may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of a crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- (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.

10. Section 2239 of the Code states:

(a) The use or prescribing for or administering to himself or herself, of any

controlled substance; or the use of any of the dangerous drugs specified in Section 4022, or of alcoholic beverages, to the extent, or in such a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to the licensee, or to any other person or to the public, or to the extent that such use impairs the ability of the licensee to practice medicine safely or more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any of the substances referred to in this section, or any combination thereof, constitutes unprofessional conduct. The record of the conviction is conclusive evidence of such 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 Medical Board may order discipline of the licensee in accordance with Section 2227 or the Medical Board may order the denial of the license 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 such 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, complaint, information, or indictment.

COST RECOVERY

11. 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, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the administrative law judge may direct a licensee 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 licensee 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 enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not limited to, charges imposed by the Attorney General.
- (d) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested pursuant to subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to costs shall not be reviewable by the board to increase the cost award. The board may reduce or eliminate the cost award, or remand to the administrative law judge if the proposed decision fails to make a finding on costs requested pursuant to subdivision (a).
- (e) If an order for recovery of costs is made and timely payment is not made as directed in the board's decision, the board may enforce the order for repayment in any appropriate court. This right of enforcement shall be in addition to any other rights the board may have as to any licensee to pay costs.
- (f) In any action for recovery of costs, proof of the board's decision shall be conclusive proof of the validity of the order of payment and the terms for payment.

- (g) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the board shall not renew or reinstate the license of any licensee who has failed to pay all of the costs ordered under this section.
- (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the board may, in its discretion, conditionally renew or reinstate for a maximum of one year the license of any licensee who demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal agreement with the board to reimburse the board within that one-year period for the unpaid costs.
- (h) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement for costs incurred and shall be deposited in the fund of the board recovering the costs to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature.
- (i) Nothing in this section shall preclude a board from including the recovery of the costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.
- (j) This section does not apply to any board if a specific statutory provision in that board's licensing act provides for recovery of costs in an administrative disciplinary proceeding.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- Officers ("Officers") received a broadcast of a collision occurring on southbound Interstate 5 in Stockton, California. The Officers responded to the site of the collision at 1:28 a.m. The Officers observed a silver 2017 Chevrolet Cruze ("Cruze") parked on the west shoulder of Interstate 5 and Respondent standing outside the vehicle. Respondent identified herself as the driver and sole occupant of the Cruze. Respondent stated that she was unsure, but thought she might have hit the rear of a semi-truck while driving. The Officers observed that the Cruze had suffered damage to the hood of the vehicle consistent with colliding with the rear of a semi-truck trailer. The airbags in the Cruze were deployed. The semi-truck trailer was not on scene when the officers arrived and there was no evidence to assist in identifying the trailer that Respondent had hit.
- 13. The Officers observed that Respondent's eyes were red and watery, her speech was slurred, and there was an odor of an alcoholic beverage on her breath and person. As Respondent had self-admitted that she had hit the back of a semi-truck trailer while operating a vehicle, the Officers performed a driving under the influence investigation. Respondent stated she had one hard seltzer at 7:00 p.m. before law enforcement made contact with her. The Officers had Respondent perform field sobriety tests as part of their investigation. During the Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus test, the Officers observed a lack of smooth pursuit with distinct sustained nystagmus

at maximum deviation, and an early on-set of sustained nystagmus. During the One Leg Stand test, the Officers observed Respondent pick up her left foot and set it down four times during the test and that she held her arms out more than six inches from her sides. During the Walk and Turn test, Respondent used her arms for balance, stepped off the line, and on the turn, Respondent incorrectly turned 90 degrees and started walking towards the lanes of traffic. The Officers stopped the test to prevent Respondent from walking out into traffic. Finally, Respondent declined to take a preliminary alcohol screening device test. The Officers placed Respondent under arrest for driving under the influence.

- 14. Pursuant to implied consent law, Respondent opted to take a breath alcohol test. At approximately 2:00 a.m., Respondent provided a blood alcohol content sample of .12% and .11%. On January 28, 2022, the San Joaquin County District Attorney's Office filed a misdemeanor criminal complaint in *The People of the State of California vs. Alexis Paula Rojas*, Case No. STK-CR-MDUI-2022-0001110. The complaint alleged that Respondent operated a motor vehicle on or about November 20, 2021, while under the influence of alcohol in violation of misdemeanor Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivisions (a) and (b). On June 27, 2022, Respondent pled no contest to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code 23152, subdivision (b), in the above-entitled criminal case. That same day, Respondent was sentenced to three years' informal probation, ordered to obey all laws, ordered to serve two days in custody with custody for time served, pay fines and fees, and ordered to complete a 3-month DMV approved alcohol program.
- 15. On August 30, 2023, a Board investigator interviewed Respondent. Respondent stated she consumed six hard seltzers and three shots of tequila at a friend's house before driving on November 20, 2021. Respondent stated she began drinking at 6:00 p.m. on November 19, 2021, and stopped drinking at 10:30 pm on November 19, 2021.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

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

16. Respondent has subjected her license to disciplinary action under section 2227, as defined by sections 2234, subdivision (a), 2239, 2529.1, and 3576 of the Code, in that she used