

Amendment No. 766

Senate Amendment to Assembly Bill No. 95 First Reprint (BDR 54-648)

**Proposed by:** Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy

**Amends:** Summary: No Title: Yes Preamble: No Joint Sponsorship: No Digest: Yes

ASSEMBLY ACTION		Initial and Date		SENATE ACTION		Initial and Date			
Adopted	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lost	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	Adopted	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lost	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Concurred In	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	Concurred In	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Receded	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	Receded	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

EXPLANATION: Matter in (1) *blue bold italics* is new language in the original bill; (2) green bold italic underlining is new language proposed in this amendment; (3) ~~red strikethrough~~ is deleted language in the original bill; (4) ~~purple double strikethrough~~ is language proposed to be deleted in this amendment; (5) orange double underlining is deleted language in the original bill that is proposed to be retained in this amendment; and (6) green bold underlining is newly added transitory language.

DP/TMC



Date: 5/19/2013

A.B. No. 95—Revises provisions governing prescription labels. (BDR 54-648)



ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 95—ASSEMBLYMEN SPIEGEL, KIRKPATRICK, BOBZIEN, DIAZ, CARLTON; AIZLEY, ELLIOT ANDERSON, BENITEZ-THOMPSON, CARRILLO, COHEN, DONDERO LOOP, EISEN, ELLISON, HARDY, HEALEY, HICKEY, HOGAN, MARTIN, OHRENSCHALL, PIERCE AND STEWART

FEBRUARY 13, 2013

JOINT SPONSORS: SENATORS PARKS; SPEARMAN AND WOODHOUSE

Referred to Committee on Commerce and Labor

SUMMARY—Revises provisions governing prescription labels. (BDR 54-648)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No.  
Effect on the State: No.

~

EXPLANATION – Matter in *bolded italics* is new; matter between brackets ~~omitted material~~ is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to pharmacy; ~~{requiring, with limited exceptions,}~~ **revising provisions authorizing** a pharmacist or practitioner to indicate on a prescription label if a generic drug has been substituted for a drug prescribed by brand name; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

**Legislative Counsel's Digest:**

1 Existing law authorizes a pharmacist or practitioner to indicate on the label of a  
2 prescription that a generic drug has been substituted for a drug prescribed by brand name  
3 unless the indication is prohibited by the practitioner who prescribed the drug. (NRS  
4 639.2587) This bill requires such an indication ~~{in every circumstance where a}~~ **the first time**  
5 **that the** generic drug is substituted for a drug prescribed by brand name unless the person for  
6 whom the drug is dispensed elects not to have such an indication written or typed on the label.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN  
SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

1 **Section 1.** NRS 639.2587 is hereby amended to read as follows:  
2 639.2587 If a generic drug is substituted for a drug prescribed by brand name,  
3 the pharmacist or practitioner ~~};~~  
4 ~~1. Shall note} shall:~~  
5 **1. Note** the name of the manufacturer, packer or distributor of the drug  
6 actually dispensed on the prescription; and  
7 2. ~~{Unless prohibited by the practitioner, may indicate}~~ **Indicate** the  
8 substitution by writing or typing on the label the words “substituted for ~~{}~~,” **or**

1 *substantially similar language*, following the generic name and preceding the  
2 brand name of the drug ~~†~~ *unless the person for whom the drug is dispensed elects*  
3 *not to have such an indication written or typed on the label. The provisions of this*  
4 *subsection apply only to the initial substitution of the generic drug for a drug*  
5 *prescribed by brand name.*

6 **Sec. 2.** This act becomes effective on July 1, 2013.