

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF PHARMACY**

In Re:

TOMMIE ROBINSON

Applicant

:
:
:
:
:
:

FINAL ORDER DENYING REGISTRATION

Jurisdiction

This matter comes before the District of Columbia Board of Pharmacy (the “Board”) pursuant to the Health Occupations Revision Act (the “HORA”), D.C. Official Code § 3-1201.01 ff. (2016 Repl.). The HORA, at D.C. Official Code § 3-1202.08(b)(1) (2016 Repl.), authorizes the Board to regulate the practice of pharmacy, pharmacy technicians, and pharmacy technician trainees in the District of Columbia and, at D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.14(c), authorizes the Board to deny a registration to an applicant.

Background

On or about September 18, 2025, the Board issued a Notice of Intent to Deny registration to Applicant (“Notice”).

The Notice cited the following charge as the basis for the proposed denial:

Charge I: You filed a statement with the Board that you knew or should have known was false or misleading in violation of D.C. Official Code § 3-1210.04(a), for which the Board may act under D.C. Code § 3-1205.14(a)(24).

Pursuant to Title 17 DCMR § 4105.2(c), the Notice was mailed on or about September 18, 2025, via U.S. Postal Service Certified Mail, return receipt requested to the Applicant’s mailing address on file with the Board. According to postal service tracking records, the Notice was deemed “Unclaimed” on October 11, 2025, and returned to the Board. Pursuant to Title 17 DCMR § 4105.5, Applicant was deemed served on October 11, 2025. The Notice advised Applicant that he

had twenty (20) days following receipt of the “Notice” in which to request a hearing. The Applicant did not request a hearing in this matter.

Investigative Findings of Fact

Based upon the content of the Board’s file in this matter, the Board hereby makes the following findings of fact:

1. On or about March 22, 2024, Applicant submitted an application to the District of Columbia Board of Pharmacy for a pharmacy technician trainee registration.
2. Applicant answered “No” to Question 1 of the application which asked, “Have you ever been arrested, charged, convicted, pled guilty to, or pled no contest to the violation of any criminal law of any jurisdiction whether misdemeanor or felony, including driving under the influence or while impaired, but excluding minor traffic violations? Please note that a charge or conviction does not necessarily mean a barrier to licensure.”
3. Applicant completed the required criminal background check as part of the application process.
4. The results of Applicant’s criminal background check revealed that Applicant failed to disclose a 2022 charge.
5. Applicant was contacted by the Board and directed to provide copies of the police or court records documenting the details and disposition of the charge or arrest. The letter also gave Applicant an opportunity to explain the discrepancy between his answer to the criminal background question on the application and the results of his criminal background check.
6. In his written explanation, Applicant denied that he had been arrested or charged.
7. Applicant submitted a No Paper/No Charges slip from the U.S. Attorney’s Office and a document from the Metropolitan Police Department stating that no arrest record was found.
8. The document Applicant submitted from the U.S. Attorney’s office, documented that he was arrested on 2/20/22 and that the arrest charge was “no papered” because the prosecutor declined to pursue the case.

Conclusions of Law

D.C. Official Code § 3-1210.04(a) (2016 Repl.) provides in pertinent part:

No person shall file or attempt to file with any board or the Mayor any statement, diploma, certificate, credential, or other evidence if the person knows, or should know, that it is false or misleading.

D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.14 (2016 Repl.) provides in pertinent part:

(a) Each board, subject to the right of a hearing as provided by this subchapter, on an affirmative vote of a majority of its members then serving, may take 1 or more of the disciplinary actions provided in subsection (c) of this section against any Applicant, licensee, or person permitted by this subchapter to practice the health occupation regulated by the board in the District who:

(24) Violates any provision of this chapter or rules and regulations issued pursuant to this chapter.

(c) Upon determination by the board that an applicant, licensee, registrant, person certified, or person permitted by this subchapter to practice in the District has committed any of the acts described in subsection (a) of this section, the board may:

(1) Deny a license, registration, or certification to any applicant or an application to establish a school of nursing or nursing program,

(2) Revoke or suspend the license, registration, or certification of any licensee, registrant, or person certified or withdraw approval of a school of nursing or nursing program;

(3) Revoke or suspend the privilege to practice in the District of any person permitted by this subchapter to practice in the District;

(4) Reprimand any licensee, registrant, person certified, or person permitted by this subchapter to practice in the District;

(5) Impose a civil fine not to exceed \$5,000 for each violation by any applicant, licensee, registrant, person certified, or person permitted by this subchapter to practice in the District;

(6) Require a course of remediation, approved by the board, which may include:

(A) Therapy or treatment;

(B) Retraining;

(C) Reexamination, in the discretion of and in the manner prescribed by the board, after the completion of the course of remediation; and

- (D) Require participation in continuing education and professional mentoring;
- (7) Require a period of probation; or
- (8) Issue a cease and desist order pursuant to § 3-1205.16.

I. Filed a False or Misleading Statement with the Board

As set forth in the findings of fact, Applicant answered “No” to the criminal background screening question which asked, “Have you ever been arrested, charged, convicted, pled guilty to, or pled no contest to the violation of any criminal law of any jurisdiction whether misdemeanor or felony, including driving under the influence or while impaired, but excluding minor traffic violations? Please note that a charge or conviction does not necessarily mean a barrier to licensure.” Applicant attested that the information given in the application was “true and complete” to the best of his knowledge. However, a criminal background check revealed that Applicant failed to disclose a 2022 arrest and charge that was on his criminal history. The documentation Applicant submitted confirmed the arrest and subsequent dismissal of the charge. Applicant was given an opportunity to address the discrepancy between his answer on the application and information found on his criminal history report. Though Applicant denied that he had been arrested or charged, he did not deny having knowledge of the matter in which it was documented that he was arrested. Therefore, the Board finds by a preponderance of the evidence that Applicant was aware of the matter and that he had been arrested.

Based on the aforementioned, the Board hereby finds by a preponderance of the evidence and concludes as a matter of law that Applicant filed a statement with the Board that he knew or should have known was false or misleading in violation of D.C. Official Code § 3-1210.04(a), for which the Board may take action under D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.14(a)(24) and (c).

Decision

In formulating its decision as to the appropriate sanction to be imposed, the Board took into consideration the nature of the bases for denial, and the Board's paramount duty to protect the public.


The Board has found that Applicant filed a statement with the Board that he knew or should have known was false or misleading. The Board finds that this basis is sufficient to support the denial of Applicant's application.

The Board views the submission of false and/or misleading statements to a professional licensing board to obtain or attempt to obtain a license or registration as a serious matter. The Board relies upon the information presented in licensure and registration applications to evaluate an applicant's fitness to be licensed or registered. The Board has a statutory duty to ensure that the health professionals it licenses and registers have the required educational background, training, competency, and professional and ethical judgment to safely practice the profession. As such, the answers provided by an Applicant in response to the application questions are material and germane to the Board's evaluation of his or her fitness for licensure or registration.

ORDER

Based upon the aforementioned it is hereby **ORDERED** that the application of Tommie Robinson for a pharmacy technician trainee registration in the District of Columbia is hereby-
DENIED, effective as of the date of service of this Order.

January 19, 2026
Date



Allison Hill, R.Ph.
Chairperson

Judicial and Administrative Review of Actions of Board

Pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.20 (2012 Repl.):

Any person aggrieved by a final decision of a board or the Mayor may appeal the decision to the **District of Columbia Court of Appeals** pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 2-510 (2012 Repl.)

Pursuant to D.C. Court of Appeals Rule 15(a):

Review of orders and decision of an agency shall be obtained by filing with the clerk of this court a petition for review within thirty (30) days after the notice is given.

This Order is the Final Order of the Board in this disciplinary matter and a public record and shall be posted on the Department of Health's website and Board newsletter, and reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank and the Healthcare Integrity Protection Data bank.

Copies to:

Tommie Robinson
Applicant

Alycia Hogenmiller
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Enforcement Section,
Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia
400 6th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001