

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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Joseph Daniel Lopez

Registered Spectacle Lens Dispenser
Applicant.

Respondent.

Case No. 4202025000232

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The Petition for Reconsideration, which has been filed by Respondent in the above-entitled matter, having been read and considered, and good cause for the granting of the petition not having been shown, the petition is hereby denied. Accordingly, the Decision shall remain effective on March 26, 2026.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 25th day of March, 2026.

- Signature on File -

Jeffrey Garcia, O.D, President
California State Board of Optometry

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

In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:

JOSEPH DANIEL LOPEZ, Respondent

Case No. 4202025000232

OAH No. 2025111092

DECISION

The attached Proposed Decision of the Administrative Law Judge is hereby adopted by the Board of Optometry as its Decision in the above-entitled matter.

This Decision shall become effective on March 26, 2026

IT IS SO ORDERED this 24th day of February

- Signature on File -

By: _____

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

In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:

JOSEPH DANIEL LOPEZ, Respondent

Agency Case No. 4202025000232

OAH No. 2025111092

CORRECTED PROPOSED DECISION

Luke VanderDrift, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), State of California, heard this matter by videoconference on December 8, 2025, in Sacramento, California.

Seth Curtis, Deputy Attorney General, represented Gregory Pruden (complainant), Executive Officer of the Board of Optometry (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

Respondent Joseph Daniel Lopez (respondent) appeared on his own behalf.

Oral and documentary evidence was received, the record was closed, and the matter was submitted for decision on December 8, 2025.

A proposed decision was transmitted to the Board on December 31, 2025. On January 7, 2026, OAH received complainant's request for corrections pursuant to

California Code of Regulations, title 1, section 1048, subdivision (a), which provides that an agency may make an application to OAH to correct a mistake or technical error, or to make minor changes in a proposed decision. The Board requested (1) paragraph 1 be changed to reflect the Board denied respondent's applications (plural), not application, (2) the language in paragraphs 6 and 18 be changed from "optometry" to "opticianry," and (3) the language in paragraph 9 be changed from "respondent" to "the respondent." OAH served the parties with complainant's request on January 7, 2026. Respondent did not file any opposition. The Board's requested changes have been made in the Corrected Proposed Decision.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

Jurisdictional Matters

1. On or about December 16, 2024, respondent filed an application for a spectacle lens dispenser registration and a contact lens dispenser registration. The Board denied the applications.

2. On October 1, 2025, complainant, in his official capacity, signed and subsequently filed a Statement of Issues against respondent based on respondent's three March 2025 convictions for resisting an officer with threats or force and the conduct underlying the convictions. Respondent timely filed a Notice of Defense, and this hearing followed.

Criminal Convictions

3. On March 13, 2025, in the Superior Court of California, County of Glenn, respondent was convicted, on his guilty plea, of violating three counts of Penal Code

section 69, resisting an officer with threats or force, a misdemeanor. The court placed respondent on informal probation for one year and ordered him to pay fines and fees.

4. The circumstances underlying respondent's convictions occurred on September 22, 2023, at approximately 6:00 p.m. Respondent had been drinking and was refusing to leave his mother's house. When Glenn County Sheriff deputies arrived, respondent would not step outside the front door and was holding a knife. Respondent yelled profanities at the deputies and threatened to kill the deputies and himself. He stabbed the front door with the knife and said he wanted the officers to kill him.

5. Eight law enforcement officers responded to the scene. Respondent repeatedly refused to put down the knife or exit the house. When the officers told respondent they would send in a police dog, respondent threatened to kill the dog. Deputies used bean bag rounds and a Taser to subdue respondent before arresting him.

Respondent's Evidence

RESPONDENT'S TESTIMONY

6. Respondent has worked at Costco since 2022. He started at the bakery and was approached about working in the opticianry department. Respondent enjoys working at Costco, hopes to remain for a long time, and the position in the opticianry department would be a positive advancement for his career at the company.

7. Regarding the circumstances of his arrest, respondent took responsibility for his actions. He wanted to hurt himself. Out of concern for his safety, his mother called the sheriff. Respondent was scared to exit the house. He did not want to hurt

anyone other than himself. Respondent realized he could have handled the situation differently. He expressed remorse toward everyone involved. Respondent does not remember everything that happened that night because he was under the influence of alcohol.

8. Respondent has struggled with alcoholism. He had a romantic relationship end in 2016, which made him depressed. Respondent was convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol in 2017. He was required to complete 90 Alcoholic Anonymous (AA) meetings as part of the case. The loss of his father the following year and then the COVID-19 pandemic led to a further deterioration of his mental health and increased problems with alcohol.

9. In March 2022, the respondent became sober. He realized alcohol was causing him harm. His father drank a lot and died from kidney failure despite stopping drinking later in his life. Respondent saw a therapist every two weeks when he became sober. He remained sober until the night of his arrest.

10. At the time of his most recent relapse in September 2023, respondent was struggling financially. When he first started working at Costco, he took a large pay cut. Respondent applied for additional jobs and received interviews, but he was not offered employment. Respondent became depressed and drank alcohol.

11. After his release from jail, respondent checked himself into Enloe Medical Center from December 22, 2023, through December 27, 2023. He was then admitted to an in-patient behavioral clinic where he completed group meetings and classes. He was offered medications but declined them because he had tried medications in the past and did not like the way they made him feel. Respondent was discharged from the behavioral clinic on December 30, 2023.

12. Respondent has not been able to receive mental health services since his discharge. The clinic gave him a list of providers, but none were taking new patients with his insurance. He was also unable to find a therapist through his work benefits. Respondent hopes to find counseling services in the future.

13. When he could not find help through counseling, respondent "dove deeper" into his faith. This has been the primary way he has kept his mental health stable. Respondent attends church weekly. He prays and reads the Bible every day. Additionally, respondent exercises every morning for three to four hours, which he finds good for his mental health. To avoid depression, respondent has found self-help books, YouTube videos, and podcasts helpful. He also believes connecting with customers at Costco is beneficial for him and the customers.

14. Respondent has remained sober since the day of his arrest. He submitted a sign-in sheet for AA meetings showing 22 entries in 2024 and one sign-in for 2025 on August 18, 2025. Respondent does not have a sponsor but has people in the group he can call if he needs help abstaining from alcohol. He relies on his sister, his uncle, and his roommate to talk with him when he has had a bad day.

15. Respondent cannot afford to pay for alcohol testing as a term of probation. His monthly income is \$3,600 per month. Respondent provided a spreadsheet of his expenses. Including rent, medical expenses, credit card debt, court fees, and vehicle expenses, he spends \$3,594 of his monthly income. Respondent is living paycheck to paycheck.

16. Respondent wants to move forward with his life and put his difficulties with alcohol and depression behind him. He never wants to drink again. Respondent is

trying to remain positive and offer something to the world. He would like to be a manager at Costco one day.

SUPPORT LETTERS

17. Respondent submitted five letters of support from his family, friends, and his landlord. They were aware of his conduct on September 22, 2023, and confirmed he has been sober without issues since then. The letters described respondent as respectful, responsible, and a good person.

18. Respondent's mother wrote her son's pursuit of opticianry was the first time she has seen him excited about a potential long-term career. His sister wrote respondent's depression, anxiety, and alcoholism were deeply rooted in their father's own issues with mental illness and alcoholism which led to an abusive environment. Respondent's family and friends commended respondent's progress in recovery.

Analysis

19. A determination whether to deny a professional license should be made only after considering the applicant's conduct and any factors introduced in mitigation, explanation, and rehabilitation. The applicant "should be permitted to introduce evidence of extenuating circumstances by way of mitigation or explanation, as well as any evidence of rehabilitation." (*Arneson v. Fox* (1980) 28 Cal.3d 440, 449; *Brandt v. Fox* (1979) 90 Cal.App.3d 737, 747.)

20. When considering the denial of a registration of an applicant who has been convicted of a crime but not yet completed the criminal sentence the Board shall evaluate the applicant's rehabilitation by considering, as relevant to this matter, the nature and gravity of the crime, the time since the commission of the crime and

completion of probation, previous criminal conduct, the terms of probation, and any other evidence of rehabilitation. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 1399.271, subd. (b).)

21. Respondent is still on probation. His crimes were serious and involved a threat of force. Although he testified he did not want to hurt anyone else, his memory of the events of his arrest is cloudy and he pled guilty to resisting an officer with threat or force. Respondent cannot impeach his convictions. (*Arneson v. Fox*, *supra* 28 Cal.3d at p. 449 [proof of a conviction “stands as conclusive evidence of [his] guilt of the offense charged”].)

22. Respondent has shown good behavior for the two years since his arrest. This change in respondent’s life is commendable. However, he has had criminal charges pending for most of this time. He was only recently placed on probation in March 2025. Because it is expected a person will act in an exemplary fashion while on probation, little weight is typically given to evidence of rehabilitation while a person is on probation. (*In re Gossage* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1080, 1099.)

23. Respondent’s criminal activity arose largely from his alcohol use. Though respondent credibly testified he is currently sober, he previously had periods of sobriety interrupted by relapse with criminal charges. Moreover, he is managing his mental health without professional assistance.

24. Respondent has the burden to prove that he is rehabilitated from his criminal conduct such that granting his application would be consistent with the public interest, safety and welfare. When all the evidence is considered, respondent did not meet his burden. As a result, his application should be denied.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

Burden and Standard of Proof

1. An applicant for a license bears the burden to prove he should be granted the license. (*Martin v. Alcohol Beverage Control Appeals Bd.* (1959) 52 Cal.2d 238.) The burden of proof is a preponderance of the evidence (Evid. Code, § 115), which means "more likely than not." (*Sandoval v. Bank of America* (2002) 94 Cal.App.4th 1378, 1388.)

Cause for Denial

2. The Board may deny a license to an applicant who has been convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a dispenser. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 480, subd. (a)(1), 2555.5, subd. (k).) A crime is considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a dispensing optician if, to a substantial degree, it "evidences present or potential unfitness of a dispensing optician to perform the functions authorized by the registration in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 1399.270, subd. (a).)

3. In determining whether a substantial relationship exists, the Board shall consider: (1) the nature and gravity of the offense; (2) the number of years elapsed since the date of the offense; and (3) the nature and duties of the registration type sought or held by the person. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 1399.270, subd. (b).) A dispenser of spectacles and lenses takes measurements to fill prescriptions and adjusts ophthalmic devices to fit the consumer. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 2550, subs. (a) and (d).)

4. Respondent resisted officers with threats or force. Although the offense occurred two years ago, he was convicted in March 2025 and remains on probation. Given that respondent was refusing to follow directions and comply with a person in authority, combined with the recency of his convictions, the convictions are substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a dispensing optician pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1399.270, subdivision (b). Cause therefore exists to deny his application for a license pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 480, subdivision (a)(1) and 2555.5, subdivision (k).

5. The Board can deny an application for a spectacle lens dispenser registration when the applicant has been convicted of a crime. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 480, subd. (a)(1), 2559.2, subd. (b).) Respondent was convicted of three counts of resisting arrest by threats or force. Cause therefore exists to deny his application for a license pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 480, subdivision (a)(1) and 2559.2, subdivision (b).

6. The Board can deny an application for a contact lens dispenser registration when the applicant has been convicted of a crime. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 480, subd. (a)(1), 2561.) Respondent was convicted of three counts of resisting arrest by threats or force. Cause therefore exists to deny his application for a license pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 480, subdivision (a)(1) and 2561.

7. As set forth in Factual Findings 19 through 24, respondent did not meet his burden to prove sufficient rehabilitation such that issuing him registrations would be consistent with the public interest, safety, and welfare. Respondent's application must therefore be denied.

ORDER

The application of respondent Joseph Daniel Lopez for a spectacle lens dispenser registration is DENIED.

The application of respondent Joseph Daniel Lopez for a contact lens dispenser registration is DENIED.

DATE: February 3, 2026

Luke VanderDrift
Luke VanderDrift (Feb 3, 2026 10:50:39 PST)
LUKE VANDERDRIFT

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings

1 ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2 ANDREW M. STEINHEIMER
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 SETH A. CURTIS
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 236263
1300 I Street, Suite 125
5 P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
6 Telephone: (916) 210-6121
Facsimile: (916) 324-5567
7 E-mail: Seth.Curtis@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Complainant

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

12 In the Matter of the Statement of Issues
Against:

13 **JOSEPH DANIEL LOPEZ**

14 **Contact Lens Dispenser Registration**
15 **Applicant**

16 **Spectacle Lens Dispenser Registration**
17 **Applicant**

18 Respondent.

Case No. 4202025000232

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

19
20 **PARTIES**

21 1. Gregory Pruden (Complainant) brings this Statement of Issues solely in his official
22 capacity as the Executive Officer of the California State Board of Optometry (Board),
23 Department of Consumer Affairs.

24 2. On or about December 16, 2024, the Board received applications for a Contact Lens
25 Dispenser Registration and Spectacle Lens Dispenser Registration from Joseph Daniel Lopez
26 (Respondent). On or about December 16, 2024, Joseph Daniel Lopez certified under penalty of
27 perjury to the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and representations in the applications. The
28 Board denied the applications on June 27, 2025.

JURISDICTION

3. This Statement of Issues 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 2555.5 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

The board may take action against any registrant who is charged with unprofessional conduct and may deny an application for a registration if the applicant has committed unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, all of the following:

...

(f) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a registration.

...

(k) Conviction of a felony or of any offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a registered dispensing optician, in which event the record of the conviction shall be conclusive evidence thereof.

...

5. Section 2559.2 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

(a) An individual shall apply for registration as a registered spectacle lens dispenser on forms prescribed by the board. The board shall register an individual as a registered spectacle lens dispenser upon satisfactory proof that the individual has passed the registry examination of the American Board of Opticianry or any successor agency to that board. In the event the board should determine, after hearing, that the registry examination is not appropriate to determine entry level competence as a spectacle lens dispenser or is not designed to measure specific job performance requirements, the board may thereafter prescribe or administer a written examination that meets those specifications. If an applicant for renewal has not engaged in the full-time or substantial part-time practice of fitting and adjusting spectacle lenses but has maintained their American Board of Opticianry and National Contact Lens Examiners registration or practiced within another state within the last three years then the board may require the applicant to take and pass the examination referred to in this section as a condition of registration. Any examination prescribed or administered by the board shall be given at least twice each year on dates publicly announced at least 90 days before the examination dates. The board is authorized to contract for administration of an examination.

(b) The board may deny registration where there are grounds for denial under the provisions of Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475).

...

6. Section 2561 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

An individual shall apply for registration as a registered contact lens dispenser on forms prescribed by the board. The board shall register an individual as a registered contact lens dispenser upon satisfactory proof that the individual has passed the contact lens

1 registry examination of the National Committee of Contact Lens Examiners or any
2 successor agency to that committee. In the event the board should ever find after hearing
3 that the registry examination is not appropriate to determine entry level competence as a
4 contact lens dispenser or is not designed to measure specific job performance requirements,
5 the board may thereafter from time to time prescribe or administer a written examination
6 that meets those specifications. If an applicant for renewal has not engaged in the full-time
7 or substantial part-time practice of fitting and adjusting contact lenses within the last five
8 years then the board may require the applicant to take and pass the examination referred to
9 in this section as a condition of registration. Any examination administered by the board
10 shall be given at least twice each year on dates publicly announced at least 90 days before
11 the examination dates. The board is authorized to contract with the National Committee of
12 Contact Lens Examiners or any successor agency to that committee to provide that the
13 registry examination is given at least twice each year on dates publicly announced at least
14 90 days before the examination dates.

15 The board may deny registration where there are grounds for denial under the
16 provisions of Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475).

17 . . .

18 7. Section 475 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

19 (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this code, the provisions of this division
20 shall govern the denial of licenses on the grounds of:

21

22 (2) Conviction of a crime.

23

24 (4) Commission of any act which, if done by a licentiate of the business or profession
25 in question, would be grounds for suspension or revocation of license.

26

27 8. Section 477 of the Code states:

28 As used in this division:

(a) "Board" includes "bureau," "commission," "committee," "department,"
"division," "examining committee," "program," and "agency."

(b) "License" includes certificate, registration or other means to engage in a business
or profession regulated by this code.

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

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

(1) The applicant has been convicted of a crime within the preceding seven
years from the date of application that is substantially related to the qualifications,
functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the application is made,
regardless of whether the applicant was incarcerated for that crime, or the applicant
has been convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications,
functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the application is made

1 and for which the applicant is presently incarcerated or for which the applicant was
2 released from incarceration within the preceding seven years from the date of
3 application.

3

4 10. Code section 493, subdivision (a) states:

5 Notwithstanding any other law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the
6 department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a
7 license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the
8 ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related
9 to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of
10 conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction
11 occurred, but only of that fact.

9 **REGULATORY PROVISIONS**

10 11. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1399.270, subdivision (a) states:

11 For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of the registration of a dispensing
12 optician pursuant to Section 141, Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475), or Section
13 2555.1 of the code, a crime, professional misconduct, or act shall be considered
14 substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a dispensing optician if,
15 to a substantial degree, it evidences present or potential unfitness of a dispensing optician to
16 perform the functions authorized by the registration in a manner consistent with the public
17 health, safety, or welfare.

15 12. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1399.271 states:

16 (a) When considering the denial of a registration under Section 480 of the code on the
17 ground that the applicant has been convicted of a crime, the Board shall consider whether
18 the applicant has made a showing of rehabilitation if the applicant completed the criminal
19 sentence at issue without a violation of parole or probation. In making this determination,
20 the Board shall consider the following criteria:

19 (1) The circumstances, nature, and gravity of the crime(s).

20 (2) The length(s) of time that has elapsed since the criminal conduct and the
21 completion of probation.

22 (3) Whether the applicant is a repeat offender of the same or similar crime(s), and the
23 total criminal record.

23 (4) The terms or conditions of parole or probation and the extent to which they bear
24 on the applicant's rehabilitation.

25 (b) If the applicant has not completed the criminal sentence at issue without a
26 violation of parole or probation, the Board determines that the applicant did not make a
27 showing of rehabilitation based on the criteria in subdivision (a), the denial is based on
28 professional misconduct, or when considering a petition for reinstatement under Section
11522 of the code, the Board shall apply the following criteria in evaluating the applicant's
rehabilitation:

28 ///

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

3 (2) Evidence of any act(s), professional misconduct, or crime(s) committed
4 subsequent to the act(s), professional misconduct, or crime(s) under consideration as
5 grounds for denial.

6 (3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s), professional misconduct,
7 or crime(s) referred to in subdivision (b)(1) or (b)(2).

8 (4) The criteria in subdivision (a)(1) through (a)(4), as applicable.

9 (5) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the applicant.

10 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION**

11 **(March 13, 2025 Criminal Conviction – Obstructing / Resisting Executive Officer)**

12 13. Respondent’s applications for a Contact Lens Dispenser Registration and Spectacle
13 Lens Dispenser Registration are subject to denial under Code sections 2555.5, subdivision (k),
14 2559.2, subdivision (b), 2561, 480, subdivision (a)(1), and 475, subdivision (a)(2), in conjunction
15 with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1399.270, subdivision (a), in that
16 Respondent was convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, duties, and
17 functions of a registered spectacle lens dispenser and registered contact lens dispenser.
18 Specifically, on March 13, 2025, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People of the State of*
19 *California v. Joseph Daniel Lopez, II*, in Glenn County Superior Court, Case Number
20 23CR18321, Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to violating three counts of Penal
21 Code section 69, subdivision (a) [Obstructing / Resisting an Executive Officer], as misdemeanors.
22 Respondent was sentenced to one year of probation and ordered to pay various fines and fees.

23 14. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are as follows: On or about September
24 20, 2023, Respondent became upset after his mother S.L. would not buy him an exercise bicycle
25 that he wanted. Respondent, who had previously been sober for sixteen (16) months, started
26 drinking on September 21, 2023, and continued drinking through the night. In the morning on
27 September 22, 2023, Respondent grabbed a kitchen knife and told S.L. to “Slit his throat”. S.L.
28 replied that she would not and attempted to talk with Respondent to get him help, which he
refused. When S.L. returned home on the evening September 22, 2023, she observed an empty
bottle of alcohol sitting on the kitchen counter. Respondent asked S.L. to go get alcohol or give

1 him whatever alcohol she had. S.L. advised that she did not have any because Respondent had
2 consumed it all. S.L. exited the residence and called 911. While standing in the driveway,
3 Respondent told S.L. that if she did not get him alcohol that he would destroy her car and that he
4 was going to create a scene. S.L. ended up giving Respondent a small bottle of wine. When S.L.
5 and Respondent re-entered the house, Respondent heard the sirens from responding officers and
6 grabbed a knife again. S.L. walked out of the residence to get away from Respondent. Officers
7 with the Glenn County Sheriff's Department responded to the location of the call spoke with S.L.
8 who was standing outside her residence. Respondent was observed standing inside the front door
9 holding a large, fixed bladed knife. As officer's attempted to speak with Respondent through a
10 glass portion of the front door, Respondent yelled profanities and told officers he wanted them to
11 kill him. After repeated requests by officers to drop the knife and come outside, Respondent
12 opened the door and stated, "Shoot me". Four bean bag rounds were deployed at Respondent
13 striking him in the chest and abdomen area. After being struck by the bean bag rounds,
14 Respondent was able to close the door and go back inside. Subsequent attempts by officers to
15 have Respondent come outside for treatment for his injuries were unsuccessful. When advised
16 that a K9 was going to be sent in, Respondent advised that if the dog went inside the house, the
17 dog would die. Respondent continued to challenge the deputies stating, "Let's go motherfucker".
18 After approximately twenty minutes, a Sergeant was able to successfully approach the front door
19 and Taser Respondent who was then transported to the hospital for medical attention.

20 **SECOND CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION**

21 **(Acts Warranting Denial of Licensure - Spectacle Lens Dispenser Registration)**

22 15. Respondent's application for a Registered Spectacle Lens Dispenser registration is
23 subject to denial under Code sections 2559.2, subdivision (b), 480, subdivision (a), and 475,
24 subdivision (a)(4), in that Respondent committed acts, which if done by a licentiate of the
25 business or profession in question, would be grounds for suspension or revocation of his license
26 as set forth in paragraphs 13 and 14 above.

27 ///

28 ///

